Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE
DISTINCTIO XII.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 218-219.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD
DISTINCTION 12

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 218-219.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Cap. I.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus prius vel plenius procedat a Patre quam a Filio.

Item quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et[1] Filio, utrum prius vel magis processerit a Patre quam a Filio; quod nititur haereticus ostendere ita dicens: si processit Spiritus sanctus a Patre, processit utique aut nato iam Filio, ante non nato Filio. Si vero iam nato Filio processit, ante natus est Filius, quam processerit Spiritus sanctus: praecessit igitur nativitas Filii processionem Spiritus sancti. Si autem processit a Patre non genito Filio, ante processit, quam Filius genitus fuerit.

Chapter I

Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds before and/or more fully from the Father than from the Son.

Likewise it is asked, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and[1] the Son, whether He proceeded before and/or more from the Father than from the Son; which the heretic strives to show thus, saying: if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, He proceeds indeed either with the Son already born, (or) before the Son (was) not yet born. However, if He proceeded with the Son already born, the Son was born before [ante . . . quam] the Holy Spirit proceeded: therefore the Nativity of the Son preceded the Procession of the Holy Spirit. But if He proceeds from the Father with the Son not begotten, He proceeds before the Son had been begotten.

His et huiusmodi quaestionibus magis laboriosis quam fructuosis respondet Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[2] dicens: « In illa summa Trinitate, quae Deus est, intervalla temporum nulla sunt, per quae possit ostendi aut saltem requiri, utrum prius de Patre natus sit Filius, et postea de ambobus processerit Spiritus sanctus ». « Nunquid ergo possumus quaerere, utrum iam processerat de Patre Spiritus sanctus, quando natus est Filius, an

To these and questions of this kind more laborious than fruitful (St.) Augustine responds in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,[2] saying: « In that most high Trinity, which is God, there are no intervals of times, through which it could be shown or at least enquired after, whether the Son be born from [de] the Father beforehand, and afterwards the Holy Spirit proceeded from Them both ». « Therefore we cannot ask, whether the Holy Spirit had already

nondum processerat et, illo nato, de utroque processit? Non possunt prorsus ista ibi quaeri, ubi nihil ex tempore inchoatur, ut consequenti[3] perficiatur in tempore. Ideo qui potest intelligere sine tempore generationem Filii de Patre, intelligat sine tempore processionem Spiritus sancti de utroque ».

proceeded from [de] the Father, when the Son was born, or whether He had not yet proceeded and, with the latter born, He proceeded from [de] Both? In a word [prorsus], these cannot be asked There, where nothing is begun on account of time, to be perfected in a consequent[3] time. For that reason, let him who can understand the generation of the Son from the Father without time, understand without time the Procession of the Holy Spirit from Both ».

Cap. II.

Quod Spiritus sanctus principaliter et proprie dicitur procedere a Patre.

Nunc tractandum est quod secundo quaerebatur, scilicet an plenius vel[4] magis procedat Spiritus sanctus a Patre quam a Filio. Ad quod dicimus, quia sicut non ante procedit a Patre quam a Filio, ita non magis vel plenius procedit a Patre quam a Filio. Augustinus tamen in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[5] dicit, quod Spiritus sanctus principaliter procedit de Patre. « Non frustra, inquit, in hac Trinitate non dicitur Verbum Dei nisi Filius, nec Donum Dei nisi Spiritus sanctus, nec de quo genitum est Verbum, et de quo procedit principaliter Spiritus sanctus, nisi Deus Pater ». Ecce audistis, quia Spiritus sanctus principaliter procedit a Patre. Sed ne te hoc turbaret, ipse continuo ex quo sensu dixerit aperit, subdens:[6] « Ideo addidi principaliter, quia et de Filio Spiritus sanctus procedere reperitur, sed hoc quoque illi Pater dedit, non iam existenti et nondum habenti. Sed quidquid unigento Verbo dedit, gignendo dedit. Sic ergo eum genuit, ut etiam de illo Donum commune procederet, et Spiritus sanctus Spirtus esset amborum ». Ecce exposuit ipsemet, . . .

Chapter II

That the Holy Spirit is said principally and properly to proceed from the Father.

Now must be treated that which was asked second, that is whether the Holy Spirit proceeds more fully and/or[4] more from the Father than from the Son. To which we say, that just as He does not proceed from the Father before (He does) from the Son, so not more nor [vel] more fully does He proceed from the Father than from the Son. However, (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book <u>On the Trinity</u>[5] says, that the Holy Spirit does proceed principally from [de] the Father. « Not as a trick », he says, « is it said in this Trinity that the “Word of God” (is) naught but the Son, or the “Gift of God” naught but the Holy Spirit, or “Him from whom the Word has been begotten”, and “Him from whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds”, naught but God the Father ». Behold you have heard, that the Holy Spirit proceeds principally from [a] the Father. But lest this trouble you, he immediately reveals in which [ex quo . . .aperit] sense he spoke, subjoining:[6] « For this reason did I add “principally”, because the Holy Spirit is also found to proceed from [de] the Son, but this the Father also gives Him, not as to one existing but not yet having. But whatever He gave to the Only-Begotten Word, He gave by begetting. Thus, therefore, did He beget Him, that the common Gift would proceed even from Him, and the Holy Spirit would belong to Both ». Behold he himself has expounded, . . .

---

[1] Solummodo edd. omnes repetunt hic *a*. Infra post *Spiritus sanctus* codd. B C D E legunt *de* loco *a*.
[2] Cap. 26. n. 45; sequens locus ibid. n. 47. —

[1] Only all the editions repeat *from* [a] here. Below after *the Holy Spirit* codices B C D and E read *from* [de] in place of *from* [a].

Contra nostros codd. et textum Augustini omnes edd. in primo loco *posset ostendi* pro *possit ostendi*.
[3] Edd. praeter 1 ponunt *ex consequenti*; sed delendum *ex* auctoritate omnium codd. et textus Augustini. Paulo supra nonnulli codd. bis ponunt *processerit* pro *processerat*.
[4] Vat. cum paucis edd. *aut*. In principio propositionis post *tractandum est* cod. D adiicit *de eo*.
[5] Cap. 17. n. 29.
[6] Vat. cum nonnullis edd. *dicens*, et paulo ante, post *sensu* addit *hoc*.

[2] Chapter 26, n. 45; the quote follow is from ibid., n. 47. — Contrary to our codices and the text of (St.) Augustine, all the editions have in the first quote *could have been shown* [posset ostendi] for *could be shown* [possit ostendi].
[3] The editions, excepting edition 1, have *out of a consequent in time* [ex consequenti . . . in tempore]; but the *out of* [ex] must be deleted on the authority of all the codices and the text of (St.) Augustine (to arrive at our reading). A little above this not a few codics twice have *proceeded* [processerit] for *had proceeded* [processerat].
[4] The Vatican edition, together with a few editions, has *or* [aut]. At the beginning of this proposition after *must be treated* [tractandum est] codex D inserts *concerning this* [de eo].
[5] Chapter 17, n. 29.
[6] The Vatican edition, together with not a few editions, has *saying* [dicens], and a little before this, after *sense he spoke* [sensu] adds *this* [hoc].

---

p. 219

quomodo Spiritus principaliter procedat a Patre, non quia prius vel magis procedat a Patre quam a Filio, sed quia, cum procedat a Filio, hoc ipsum habet Filius a Patre.

in what manner the Spirit principally proceeds from [a] the Father, not because He proceeds before and/or more from the Father than from the Son, but because, since He does proceed from the Son, this very (thing) does the Son have from the Father.

Ex eodem sensu dicitur etiam proprie procedere de Patre. Unde Hieronymus in expositione catholicae fidei Nicaenique Symboli[1] ait: « Credimus in Spiritum sanctum, qui de Patre procedit proprie ». Item: « Spiritum sanctum verum Deum invenimus in Scriptura, et de Patre proprie esse ». Et item: « De Patre Filius, et Spiritus sanctus[2] proprie et vere de Patre procedit ». Ecce aperte dicit, Spiritum sanctum proprie esse de Patre et proprie procedere a Patre. Quod non ita est intelligendum, tanquam prius vel plenius a Patre procedat quam a Filio, sed quia hoc habet Pater a se, non ab alio, ut de ipso sit et procedat Spiritus sanctus; Filius autem non a se, sed a Patre hoc habet, ut de ipso[3] sit et procedat Spiritus sanctus.

In the same sense He is also said to properly proceed from [de] the Father. Whence (St.) Jerome in (his) exposition of the Catholic Faith and the Nicene Creed[1] says: « We believe in the Holy Spirit, who properly proceeds from the Father ». Likewise: « We find in Scripture that the Holy Spirit (is) the True God, and properly is from the Father ». And likewise: « From the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit[2] properly and truly proceeds from the Father ». Behold he openly says, that the Holy Spirit properly is from the Father and properly proceeds from [a] the Father. Which thus must not be understood, as if He proceeds before and/or more fully from the Father than from the Son, but that the Father has this from Himself, not from an other, that from Him the Holy Spirit is and does proceed; but the Son has this not from Himself, but from the Father, that from Himself[3] the Holy Spirit is and does proceed.

Forte etiam iuxta hanc intelligentiam dicitur Spiritus sanctus[4] mitti per Filium et a Patre esse per Filium. Unde Hilarius ad Deum Patrem de Spiritu sancto et Filio loquens in

Perhaps according to this understanding the Holy Spirit is also said to be sent[4] through the Son and to be from the Father through the Son. Whence (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers),

duodecimo libro de Trinitate[5] ait: « In sancto Spiritu tuo ex te profecto et per eum misso ». Item: « Ante tempora Unigentus tuus ex te natus manet, ita quod ex te per eum Spirtus sanctus tuus est; quod etsi sensu non percipiam, tamen teneo conscientia. In spiritualibus enim rebus tuis hebes sum ». Item in eodem: « Conserva hanc, oro, fidei meae religionem, ut quod in regenerationis meae Symbolo professus sum, semper obtineam: Patrem scilicet te[6] et Filium tuum una tecum adorem; sanctum Spiritum tuum, qui ex te per Unigentium tuum est, promerear ». Ecce aperte dicit, Spiritum sanctum a Patre per Filium et mitti et esse; quod non est intelligendum, quasi a Patre per Filium minorem mittatur vel sit, sed quia ex Patre et Filio est et mittitur ab utroque. Sed hoc ipsum habet Filius a Patre, ut ab ipso et sit[7] et mittatur Spiritus sanctus. Hoc ergo voluit significare Hilarius, distinctionem faciens in locutione, ut ostenderet in Patre esse auctoritatem. Inde est etiam, quod Veritas ostendens, Patrem esse auctorem processionis, qua procedit Spiritus sanctus a Filio, dixit in Evangelio:[8] *De Patre procedit*, cum de Patre et Filio procedat Spiritus sanctus. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate:[9] « Si de Patre et Filio procedit Spiritus sanctus, cur Filius dixit: *De Patre procedit ?* Cur putas, nisi quia solet ad eum referre etiam quod ipsius est, de quo et ipse est, sicut ait:[10] *Mea doctrina non est mea, sed eius, qui misit me ?* Si ergo hic intelligitur eius doctrina, quam tamen non dixit suam, sed Patris, quanto magis illic intelligendus est Spiritus sanctus de ipso procedere, ubi sic ait: *De Patre procedit*, ut non diceret: De me non procedit. A quo autem habet Filius, ut sit Deus — est enim Deus de Deo — ab illo utique habet, ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus sanctus. Et ideo Spiritus sanctus, ut etiam de Filio procedat, sicut procedit de Patre, ab ipso habet Patre ». « Quapropter, qui potest intelligere in eo, quod ait Filius:[11] *Sicut habet Pater vitam in semetipso, sic dedit et Filio vitam habere in semetipso*, non sine vita existenti iam Filio vitam Patrem dedisse, sed ita eum sine tempore genuisse, ut vita, quam Pater Filio gignendo dedit, coaeterna sit vitae Patris, qui dedit; intelligat etiam, sicut habet Pater in semetipso, ut de illo procedat Spiritus

In speaking to God the Father of the Holy Spirit and the Son, says in the twelfth book On the Trinity:[5] « In Thy Holy Spirit, (having) come forth from Thee [ex te profecto] and (having been) sent through Him ». Likewise: « Before the ages [tempora] Thy Only-Begotten, born from [ex] Thee, remained, such that Thy Holy Spirit is from [ex] Thee and through Him; whom even if I do not perceive by sense, I yet hold in conscience. For I am stupid in the spiritual affairs which regard Thee [rebus tuis hebes] ». Likewise in the same (work): « Guard this, I pray, religion of my Faith, that I may always obtain, that which I have professed in the Creed of my New Life [regenerationis]: May I adore the Father, that is, Thee[6] and Thy Son, as One with Thee; may I deserve Thy Holy Spirit, who is from [ex] Thee through Thy Only-Begotten ». Behold he openly says, that the Holy Spirit from [a] the Father through the Son both is sent and is; which is not to be understood, as if from the Father through a minor Son He is sent and/or is, but that from [ex] the Father and the Son He is and is sent by Each [ab utroque]. But this very (thing) the Son has from the Father, that from Himself the Holy Spirit both is[7] and is sent. Therefore (St.) Hilary wanted to signify this, making a distinction in speech, to show that the Authorship [auctoritatem] is in the Father. Hence it is also, that the Truth showing, that the Father is the Author of the Procession, by which the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, said in the Gospel:[8] *Who proceeds from* [de] *the Father*, when the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book On the Trinity (says):[9] « If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, why did the Son say: *Who proceeds from the Father ?* Why do you think, except that it is His custom [solet] to refer even that which belongs to Himself to Him, from whom He also is, just as He says:[10] *My doctrine is not Mine, but His, who sent Me ?* If here, therefore, the doctrine is to be understood (to be) His, which He did not call His own, but the Father's, how much more in that (passage) is the Holy Spirit to be understood to proceed from Him, where he thus says: *Who proceeds from the Father*, since He did not say: "Who does not proceed from Me."

sanctus, sic dedisse Filio, ut etiam de isto procedat idem Spiritus sanctus, et utrumque sine tempore. Ita ergo dictum est, Spiritum sanctum de Patre procedere, ut intelligatur, quod etiam procedit de Filio de Patre esse Filio.[12] Si enim quidquid habet, de Patre habet Filius, de Patre habet utique, ut et de illo procedat Spiritus sanctus. Sed nulla ibi tempora cogitentur, quae habeant prius et posterius, quia ibi omnino nulla sunt ».

From whom, moreover, the Son has, that He is God — for He is God from [de] God — indeed from [a] Him He has, that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Himself. And for that reason the Holy Spirit has from the Father Himself, that He proceeds from [de] the Son even as [etiam sicut] He proceeds from the Father ». « On which account, let him who can understand in this (passage), what the Son says:[11] *Just as the Father has Life in Himself, in this manner has He given even to the Son to have Life in Himself*, not that the Father gave life to a Son, existing without life, but that He thus begot Him without time, so that the Life, which the Father gave to the Son by begetting (Him), is the coeternal Life of the Father, who gave (It); understand also, just as the Father has Life in Himself, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him, so He has given to the Son, that the same Holy Spirit proceeds also from Him, and each without time. Therefore, thus has is been said, 'that the Holy Spirit proceeds from [de] the Father,' so that there is understood, 'that it has (been granted) from the Father to the Son that He proceeds also from the Son.'[12] For if He has anything, the Son has (it) from the Father, indeed He has it from the Father, such that the Holy Spirit also proceeds from Him. But let no ages [tempora] be thought of There, which have a "before" and "after", because in that place [ibi] there are entirely none ».

---

[1] Explan. ad Cyrillum c. 1. et 3.
[2] Omnes codd. omittunt *sanctus*.
[3] Codd. D E cum sola Vat. *de se ipso*, quod antea, ubi prima vice occurrit, habet cod. C.
[4] Omnes codd. bene addunt *a Patre*, sed cum hoc desit in omnibus nostris edd., nihil immutavimus in textu.
[5] Num. 55; sequens locus n. 56, tertius n. 57.
[6] Edd. omnes contra originale et codd. sic transponunt verba: *te Patrem scilicet*.
[7] Vat. cum paucis edd. omittit *et*.
[8] Ioan. 15, 26; Vulgata *a Patre*. — Mox multae edd. contra edd. 1, 7 et mss. addunt *et* post *cum*; insuper edd. pleraeque omittunt *santus* post *Spiritus*.
[9] Cap. 27. n. 48.
[10] Ioan. 7, 16. — Immediate antea Vat. cum paucis edd. contra originale et mss., addendo *sicut* et transponendo *et*, sic habet; *ipsius est, sicut et de quo*.
[11] Ioan. 5, 26.
[12] Vat. cum aliis edd., excepta 1, perperam et contradicentibus mss. et textu Augustini praemittit *et* ante *Filio*. Sensus est: intelligatur, a Patre datum

---

[1] <u>Explanation to Cyril</u>, ch. 1 and 3.
[2] All the codices omit *Holy* [sanctus].
[3] Codices D and E, together with only the Vatican edition, have *from His very self* [de se ipso], which Codex C likewise has before this, where it first occurs.
[4] All the codices add *from the Father* [a Patre], but since this is lacking in all our editions, we have changed nothing in the text.
[5] N. 55; the following passage is n. 56, the third n. 57.
[6] All the editions, contrary to the original and the codices, transpose the words in this manner: *Thee, the Father, that is* [te Patrem scilicet].
[7] The Vatican edition, together with a few of the editions, omits *both* [et].
[8] Jn. 15:26; the Vulgate reads *from the Father* [a Patre]. — Then many editions, contrary to editions 1 and 7 and the manuscripts, add *both* [et] after *proceeds* [Trans. Note: in the Latin text after *cum*]; moreover very many of the editions omit *Holy* [sanctus] in the same phrase.
[9] Chapter 27, n. 48.

esse Filio, quod Spiritus sanctus etiam de ipso procedit. — Paulo post Vat. cum nonnullis edd. omittit *et* ante *de illo procedat*. Denique edd. 2, 3 *cogitantur* loco *cogitentur*.

[10] Jn 7:16. — Immediately before this the Vatican edition, together with a few of the editions, contrary to the original and the manuscripts, by adding *just as* [sicut] and transposing *and* [et], reads thus: *to Him even That which belongs to Himself, as (That) from which He (is) and (That which) He Himself is*. [ipsius est, sicut et de quo et ipse est].

[11] Jn 5, 26.

[12] The Vatican edition, together with the other editions, excepting edition 1, faultily and by contradicting the manuscripts and the text of (St.) Augustine, inserts a *and* [et] before *the Son* [Filio: which thus reads *from the Father and the Son*]. The Sense of our text is: so that there is understood, that it has been given by the Father to the Son, that the Holy Spirit proceeds even from Him. — A little after this the Vatican edition, together with not a few editions, omits *also* [et] before *proceeds from Him* [de illo procedat]. then editions 2 and 3 have *But no ages . . . are thought of* [Sed . . . cogitantur] in place of *But let no ages . . . be thought of* [Sed cogitantur].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PRIMI LIBRI

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XII.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XII

De aeterna processione Spiritus sancti, qualiter a Patre et Filio procedat.

On the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, in what manner He proceeds from the Father and the Son.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

ARTICLE SOLE

Quaestio I.

Question 1

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 219-221.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 219-221.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Item quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Haec est secunda pars, in qua Magister determinat, qualiter Spiritus sanctus procedit[1] a Patre et Filio; et haec pars habet quatuor capitula secundum quatuor, quae determinat in quatuor capitulis.[2] Nam *primo* quaerit et determinat, utrum Spiritus sanctus prius procedat a Patre, et determinat, quod . . .

Likewise it is asked, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son..

DIVISION OF THE TEXT

This is the second part, in which Master (Peter) determines, in what manner the Holy Spirit proceeds[1] from the Father and the son; and this part has four short chapters [quatuor capitula] according to the four (questions), which he determines in the four short chapters.[2] For *first* he asks and determines, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds more first from the Father, and He determines that . . .

---

[1] Aliqui codd. ut A I S T V Y *procedat*.
[2] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 paulo ante ponendo *partes* loco *capitula*, et omissis verbis *in quatuor capitulis* prosequitur *In prima quaerit, utrum*, et paulo infra *In secunda quaerit, utrum*. Dein post *Tertio* omittit *vero determinat*, moxque verba *et dicit quod sic*.

[1] Some codices, such as A I S T V Y, have the subjunctive *proceeds* [procedat].
[2] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, by putting *parts* [partes] in place of *short chapters* [capitula], and having omitted the words *in the four short chapters* [in quatuor capitulis] proceeds thus: *In the first he asks, whether* [In prima quaerit, utrum], and a little below this has *In the second he asks, whether* [In secunda quaerit, utrum]. then after *Third*, it omits *however he determines* [vero determinat], and then omits the words *and he says that (it is) so* [et dicit quod sic].

---

p. 220

non. *Secundo*, utrum principalius et plenius, ibi: *Nunc tractandum est quod secundo quaerebatur*. *Tertio* vero determinat, utrum proprie a Patre procedat, et dicit quod *sic*, ibi: *Ex eodem sensu dicitur etiam proprie procedere de Patre*. *Quarto* determinat, utrum Spiritus sanctus proprie procedat a Patre per Filium, ibi: *Forte etiam iuxta hanc intelligentiam*, ubi confirmat auctoritate Hilarii, quod Spiritus sanctus mittitur a Patre per Filium et procedit.

(it is) *not*. *Second*, whether more principally and more fully, there (where he says: *Now must be treated that which was asked second*. *Third*, however he determines, whether properly He proceeds from the Father, and he says that (it is) *so*, there (where he says): *In the same sense He is also said to properly proceed from* [de] *the Father.* *Fourth* he determines, whether the Holy Spirit properly proceeds from [a] the Father through the Son, there (where he says): *Perhaps according to this understanding*, where he confirms by the authority of (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers), that the Holy Spirit is sent and proceeds from the Father through the Son.

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

Supposito ex praecedentibus, quod Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio, ad intelligentiam huius partis quatuor quaeruntur de processione Spiritus sancti in comparatione ad utrumque.

Having supposed from the preceding, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, for an understanding of this part four (things) are asked concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit in comparison to Each.

Primo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus prius procedat a Patre quam a Filio.
Secundo, utrum plenius a Patre quam a Filio.
Tertio, utrum procedat a Patre mediante Filio.
Quarto et ultimo, utrum processio Filii prior sit secundum ordinem intelligendi processione Spiritus sancti, vel e converso.

First there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father before [prius quam] (He does) from the Son.
Second, whether (He does) more fully from the Father than from the Son.
Third, whether He proceeds from the Father by means of the Son.
Fourth and last, whether the procession of the Son is prior, according to the order of understanding, to the procession of the Holy Spirit, or the other way around.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

De processione Spritus sancti in comparatione ad Patrem et Filium.

ARTICLE SOLE

On the procession of the Holy Spirit in comparison to the Father and the Son.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus a Patre prius quam a Filio procedat.

QUESTION 1

Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father before (He does) from the Son.

Circa primum, quod *prius* sit a Patre quam a Filio, sic ostenditur.

About the first, that He is from the Father before (He is) from the Son, is shown in this manner:

1. Causa prima est, in qua est status, ergo et principium primum est, in quo est status; sed status est in Patre: ergo Pater est principium primum; sed primum supponit prius:[1] ergo prius procedit a Patre quam a Filio.

1. (That) cause is the first, in which there is a standing-still [status], therefore also (that) principle is first, in which there is a standing-still; but there is a standing-still in the Father: therefore the Father is the first principle; but the "first" supposes the "prior":[1] therefore He proceeds from the Father before (He does) from the Son.

2. Item, causa prima est quae agit, alia non supposita:[2] si ergo Pater producit non per suppositionem alterius principii, Filius per suppositionem, prius producit Pater quam Filius.

2. Likewise, (that) cause is first which acts, with another not supposed:[2] if therefore the Father produces not through a supposition of the other Principle, the Son through a supposition (of One), the Father produces before the Son.

3. Item, quod habet aliquis ex se per prius habet, quam quod habet ex alio; sed producere Spiritum sanctum habet Pater a se, et Filius a Patre: ergo per prius habet Pater quam Filius.

3. Likewise, that which anyone has out of himself, he has through (a consideration of what) is prior to, that which he has out of another; but 'that He produces the Holy Spirit' the Father has from Himself, and the Son from the Father: therefore the Father has (this) through (a consideration of what

is) prior to the Son (having it).

Contra: 1. Ubi non est ponere posterius, nec prius, quia prius respectu posterioris dicitur; sed in Trinitate non est ponere posterius: ergo nec prius. Si ergo processio Spiritus sancti a Patre et Filio est aeterna, patet etc.

On the contrary: 1. Where there is no positing of the "posterior", neither of the "prior", because "prior" is said in respect of "posterior", but in the Trinity there is no positing of the "posterior": therefore neither of the "prior". If therefore the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son is eternal, it is clear etc.

2. Item, ubi est ponere prius et posterius, est[3] ponere diversitatem principiorum; sed Pater et Filius producunt Spiritum sanctum in quantum unum, ut supra monstratum est:[4] ergo non est ibi ratio prioris.

2. Likewise, where there is a positing of a "prior and posterior", there is[3] a positing of a diversity of principles; but the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit inasmuch as (They are) one, as has been shown above:[4] therefore there is no reckoning of the "prior" There.

3. Item, si per prius procedit a Patre quam a Filio, aut[5] a Filio non procedit, aut bis procedit; sed procedit a Filio et non procedit bis: ergo etc.

3. Likewise, if He proceeds from the Father through (a consideration of what is) prior to (His procession) from the Son, either[5] He does not proceed from the Son, or He proceeds twice; but He does proceed from the Son and He does not proceed twice: ergo etc..

4. Item, contingit intelligere prius, non intellecto posteriori: ergo si per prius procedit a Patre, ergo contingit intelligere, quod procedit,[6] non cointellecto Filio. *Sed contra*: Spiritus sanctus est amor uniens et amor nectens; sed non est accipere mutuum amorem ad minus quam inter duos, ergo nec Spiritum sanctum esse[7] nisi a duobus: ergo nec per prius procedit ab uno quam ab alio.

4. Likewise, it happens that one understands the prior, not having understood the posterior: therefore if He proceeds from the Father through (a consideration of what is) prior, therefore it happens that one understands, that He proceeds,[6] with the Son not understood to be with [non cointellecto Filio] (the Father). *But on the contrary*: the Holy Spirit is a uniting love and a joining love; but there is no accepting of a mutual love according (to what is) lesser than (that which exists) between two, therefore neither 'that the Holy Spirit is'[7] except 'from Two': therefore neither does He proceed from One through (a consideration of what is) prior to (His procession) from the Other.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus auctoritate quidem prius procedit a Patre quam a Filio, non vero prius duratione, vel causalitate, vel etiam origine.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit according to Authorship indeed proceeds from the Father before (He does) from the Son, not however according to duration, and/or causality, and/or even origin.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *prius* dicitur multipliciter. Dicitur enim prius *duratione*, dicitur prius *causalitate*, dicitur prius *origine*, dicitur prius *auctoritate*.[8] Et primis duobus modis *prius* nullo modo cadit in Deo; quia prius *duratione* contrarium est

I respond: It must be said, that "*prior*" is said in a manifold manner. For "prior" is said according to *duration*, "prior" is said according to *causality*, "prior" is said according to *origin*, "prior" is said according to *authorship* [auctoritate].[8] And in the first

aeternitati, prius *causalitate* contrarium est essentiae unitate.[9] Sed prius *origine*, quo alter ex altero, . . .

two manners the “prior” in no manner occurs [cadit] in God; because (what is) prior according to *duration* is contrary to eternity, (what is) prior according to *causality* is contrary to the unity[9] of the Essence. But (what is) prior according to *origin*, by which the one (is) out of the other, . . .

---

[1] Cod. K adiungit: *quia superlativum supponit comparativum*.
[2] Arist., IV. Phys. text. 7. (c. 1.) ait: Id enim, sine quo aliorum nihil aliud est, ipsum vero est sine aliis, necesse est esse primum. — Paulo infra post *Filius* in cod. O additur *vero*.
[3] Cod. I praemittit *ibi*.
[4] Dist. 11. q. 2.
[5] Cod. T cum ed. 1 bene addit *ergo*.
[6] In cod. T et ed. 1 adiungitur bene *a Patre*.
[7] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 *Spiritus sanctus est*.
[8] Cfr. Aristot., de Praedicam. c. de Priori, et V. Metaph. text. 16. (IV. c. 11.). — In hac propositione ex multis mss. ut A F G H I K T V W Z aa etc. et ed. 1 ter supplevimus *dicitur*.
[9] Cod. X *immutabilitati*.

[1] Codex K adds: *because the superlative supposes the comparative* [quia superlativum supponit comparativum]. [Trans. note: “first” in Latin is a superlative.]
[2] Aristotle, Physics, Bk. IV, text 7 (ch. 1) says: For that, without which nothing else belongs to others, but it itself is without the others, is necessary that it be first. — A little below this after *the Son* in codex O there is added *however* [vero].
[3] Codex I reads *there there is* [ibi est].
[4] Distinction 11 q. 2.
[5] Codex T together with edition 1 does well to add here a *therefore* [ergo].
[6] In codex T and edition 1 there is well added here *from the Father* [a Patre].
[7] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, reads *neither is the Holy Spirit* [nec Spiritus sanctus est].
[8] Cf. Aristotle, On the Predicaments, ch. on “The Prior”, and Metaphysics, Bk. V, text 16 (Bk. IV, ch. 11). — In this proposition, from many manuscripts, such as A F G H I K T V W Z aa etc. and edition 1, we have thrice supplied *is said* [dicitur].
[9] Codex X has *to the immutability* [immutabilitati].

---

p. 221

et prius *auctoritate*, quo alter accipit ab altero,[1] cadit ibi. Sed prius *origine* cadit respectu *producentis* et *producti*, cum alter oritur ex altero; cum vero *unus* oritur *a duobus*, non cadit ibi prius *origine*, quia tunc ambo sunt unum originale principium; tamen cadit ibi prius *auctoritate*, quia quamvis Pater et Filius sint unum in producendo, tamen hoc accipit Filius a Patre.

and (what is) prior according to *authorship*, by which the One accepts from the Other,[1] does occur There. But (what is) prior according to *origin* occurs in respect of the *One producing* and the *One produced*, since the One arises out of the Other; however, since *One* arises *from Two*, there does not occur There a “prior” according to *origin*, because Both then are one original principle; nevertheless there does fall There a “prior” according to *authorship*, because although the Father and the Son are one in producing, nevertheless the Son accepts this from the Father.

Si igitur quaeritur, utrum per prius procedat Spiritus sanctus a Patre quam a Filio; si intelligatur prius[2] *duratione*, falsum est; similiter si prius *causalitate*; similiter si prius *origine*, sicut probant primae rationes ad hoc inductae. Si autem prius *auctoritate*, ut *prius* idem sit quod *principalius*, veritatem

If, therefore, there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through (a consideration of what is) prior to (His procession) from the Son; if “prior”[2] be understood according to duration, it is false; similarly if “prior” (be understood) according to causality; similarly

habet.

if the “prior” (be understood) according to origin, just as the reasons first mentioned for this prove. But if the “prior” (be understood) according to *authorship*, so that (what is) *prior* is the same as what (is) *more principal*, it has truth.

1. Ad illud ergo[3] quod primo obiicitur, quod Pater est primum principium et causa; dicendum, quod illae rationes habent veritatem, ubi est pluralitas causarum vel principiorum; sed respectu Spiritus sancti nec est pluralitas causarum nec principiorum.

2. To that which, therefore,[3] is first objected, that the Father is the first principle and cause; it must be said, those reasons have truth, where there is a plurality of causes and/or principles; but in respect of the Holy Spirit there is neither a plurality of causes nor principles.

2. 3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod per[4] prius habet quod habet ex se; dicendum, quod si intelligatur *prius*, id est *principalius*, verum est; si autem alio modo, falsum, quia unum et idem potest haberi a pluribus personis, ita quod ab una per aliam; nec talis est prioritas aliquo trium praedictorum modorum.

2. 3. To that which is objected, that through[4] something prior one has what he has out of himself; it must be said, that if it is understood to be (something) *prior*, that is *more principle*, it is true; but if in another manner, false, because one and the same can be had by very many persons, such that (it is had) from one through an other; nor is there such priority in any of the three aforesaid manners.

SCHOLION.

I. Posita quadruplici *prioritatis* distinctione, primo negatur, Spiritum sanctum procedere prius *duratione*, *casalitate*, *origine* a Patre quam a Filio. Prioritas enim *durationis* et *causalitatis* in Deo esse omnino non potest; prioritas autem *originis* dici quidem potest in divinis, sed tantum, quatenus una persona procedit ab uno, et altera a duabus. Ergo non est ponenda inter Patrem et Filium, quatenus producuunt Spiritum sanctum. Deinde conceditur, quod Spiritus sanctus prius procedat *auctoritate*, vel etiam *principalius* a Patre quam a Fio. Hoc nulla alia ratione asseritur, nisi quia Pater a se ipso habet potentiam spirativam, Filius vero a Patre; unde Patri quaedam principalitas convenit, quae tamen nec subiectionem Filii nec distinctionem in principio spirativo importat. In re hoc idem est cum eo quod dicit Scot. (hic q. 2): « Non est ergo ordo originis inter spirationem Patris et Filii, quasi spiret Pater in aliquo signo originis, in quo non spiret Filius, sed in eodem signo originis simul spirant. Est tamen ibi ordo spirantium in spirando, quia Pater (producto termino primae fecunditatis) in illo tertio signo originis spirat a se, Filius autem non a se ».

SCHOLIUM

I. Having posited a fourfold distinction of *priority*, there is first denied, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father according to *duration*, *causality*, (or) *origin* before (He does) from the Son. For a priority of *duration* and *causality* cannot be in any manner [esse omnino]; but a priority of *origin* can indeed be said among the divine, but only, to the extent that one Person proceeds from One, and the Other from the Two. Therefore it is not to be posited between the Father and the Son, to the extent that They produce the Holy Spirit. Next, there is conceded, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father according to *authorship* prior to, and/or even *more principally* than from the Son. For this no other reason is asserted, except that the Father has from Himself [a se ipso] the power of spirating, but the Son from the Father; whence a certain principality befits the Father, which, nevertheless, conveys neither a subjection upon the Son, nor a distinction at the beginning of the spiration [in principio spirativo]. In this matter, what (Bl. John Duns) Scotus says (here at q. 2), is the same: « There is not, therefore, an order of origin between the spiration of the Father and the Son, as if the Father spirates, under [in] some sign of origin, in

which the Son does not spirate, rather They spirate together under the same sign of origin. Nevertheless, there is There an order of Ones spirating in spirating, because the Father (with the Term of the first fecundity produced) under that third sign of origin does spirate from Himself [a se], but the Son not by Himself [a se] ».

II. Pro maiore explicatione solutionis ad 3. serviunt quae dicit B. Albert., hic a. 3. ad 2: « Dicendum, quod hoc (quod una proprietas non est duorum subiectorum) verum est in illis suppositis, quae per essentiam et substantiam dividuntur ab invicem; in illis enim quod inest uni idem numero non inest alii. Sed duobus suppositis, quae in nulla diversa sunt, nisi (quod) inter ea est relationis opposito, potest inesse idem, in quantum non relative opponuntur. Pater autem et Filius talia sunt supposita divinae naturae; et secundum quod comparantur ad virtutem spiralem et ad Spiritum sanctum, non habent oppositionem relativam inter se, ergo secunum hoc remanent idem, et sic unum numero erit quod in hac comparatione inest eis. Hoc autem est proprietas spirandi, et sic unum sunt principium spirandi Spiritus sancti ».

II. For a greater explanation of the solution to n. 3, it will be useful to hear what Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus) says, there in a. 3, n. 2: « It must be said, that this (that one property does not belong to two subjects) is true in those supposits, which are divided from each other through (their) essence and substance; for among them, that which is in one the same according to number is not in the other. But for two supposits, which are diverse in nothing, except (that) among them there is an opposition of relation, there can be in them the same, inasmuch are they are not relatively opposed. Moreover the Father and the Son are such Supposits of the divine Nature; and according to which They are compared to spirative virtue [virtutem spiralem] and to the Holy Spirit, They do not have a relative opposition among them, therefore according to this They remain the same, and in this manner one in number will be that which in this comparison is in Them. But this is the property of spirating, and thus They are the one principle of spirating of the Holy Spirit ».

III. Cfr. infra d. 20. a. 2. q. 1. 2. — Scot., de hac et duabus seqq. qq. hic q. 2. — S. Thom., de hac et seq. hic q. 1. a. 2. — B. Albert.,* hic a. 2; de hac et seq. q., S. p. I. tr. 7. m. 3. q. 2. incident. — Petr. a Tar., hic 1. princ. q. 2. — Henr. Grand., de hac et duab. seqq. qq. S. a. 54. q. 5. et 7.; a. 60. q. 9. — Dionys. Carth., de hac et duabus seqq. qq. hic q. 1. — Biel, de hac et duab. seqq. qq. hic q. 3.

III. Cf. below d. 20, a. 2, q. 1 and 2. — (Bl John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following two questions, here in q. 2. — St. Thomas, on this and the following question, here in q. 1, a. 2. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus Magus,* there in a. 2; on this and the following question, Summa, p. I, tr. 7, m. 3, q. 2 incident. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in 1st princ., q. 2. — Henry of Ghent, on this and the two following questions, Summa, a. 54, q. 5 and 7; a. 60, q. 9. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, on this and the following two questions, here in q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following two questions, here in q. 3.

---

* Hic nota originalis, post *de hac e seq. q.* loco , habet ; sed perperam.
[1] Cod. R addit *bene*.
[2] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus *prius*. Paulo infra sequimur codd. M Y et ed. 1 addendo:

* Here the note by the Quarrachi Editors after *of this and the following question* [de hac et seq. q.], had a semicolon in place of the comma.
[1] Codex R adds *well* [bene].
[2] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and

similiter si prius origine. — Consentit Anselm, de Proces. Spir. sanct. c. 23-25.
[3] Vat. omittit contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1 *ergo*. Mox ed. 1 post *et* bene addit *prima*.
[4] Fide aliquorum mss. ut Y Z et ed. 1 supplevimus *per*, quod et supra in ipsa obiectione habetur. Paulo ante unus alterve codex *aliud* loco *illud*.

edition 1, we have inserted *the "prior"* [prius]. A little below this we follow codex M Y and edition 1, by adding: *similarly if the "prior" according to origin* [similiter si prius origine]. — St. Anselm (of Canterbury) agrees in his On the Procession of the Holy Spirit, chs. 23-25.
[3] The Vatican edition, contrary to the older codices and edition 1, omits *therefore* [ergo].
[4] Trusting in the other manuscripts, such as Y Z and edition 1, we have supplied *through* [per], which is also had above in this objection. A little before this one or the other codex has *the other* [aliud] for *that* [illud].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 221-223.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 221-223.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus a Patre plenius et principalius quam a Filio procedat.

QUESTION 2

Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father more fully and more principally than

from the Son.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum plenius procedat a Patre quam a Filio. Et quod sic, videtur:

1. Quia propter quod unumquodque, et illud magis:[5] ergo cum Filius spiret per Patrem, quia hoc habet a Patre, ergo Pater magis spirat.

2. Item, « omnis causa prima plus influit quam secunda »;[6] sed Pater est primum principium spirandi: ergo plus influit quam Filius.

3. Item, plenius procedit aliquid, a quo procedit proprie et principaliter, quam a quo nec principaliter nec proprie: sed Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre proprie et principaliter, sicut dicitur in littera[7] et Augustinus dicit: ergo etc.

4. Item, plenius procedit aliquis ab eo, a quo habet quidquid habet, scilicet substantiam et proprietatem, quam a quo non habet; sed Spiritus san- / -ctus . . .

Second there is asked, whether He proceeds more fully from the Father than from the Son. And that it is so, seems:

1. Because that on account of which each one (is or acts) also (is or has it) to a greater degree [magis]:[5] therefore since the Son spirates through the Father, because He has this from the Father, therefore the Father spirates more.

2. Likewise, « every first cause influences more than the second »;[6] but the Father is the first principle of spirating: therefore He influences more than the Son.

3. Likewise, more fully does anything proceed, from that which it proceeds properly and principally, than from that which (it) neither principally nor properly (does): but the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father properly and principally, just as is said in the text (of Master Peter)[7] and (as St.) Augustine also says: ergo etc..

4. Likewise, more fully does anyone proceed from that, from which it has whatever it has, namely, substance and property, than from that which it does not have; but the Holy Spirit . . .

---

[5] Aristot., I. Poster. c. 2. Cfr. etiam II. Metaph. text. 4. (I. brev. c. 1.). — In quo textu plures codd. post *unumquodque* addunt *tale*. Mox circa finem argumenti ope mss. et primarum edd. restituimus *habet*.
[6] Libr. de Causis, prop. 1, in quo textu plures codd. ut B D E F G M X etc. cum edd. 2, 3 falso *prius* loco *plus*.
[7] Cap. 2; ubi et verba Augustini habentur. — Unus alterve codex ut Y Z *Magister dicit* pro *dicitur*.

[5] Aristotle, Posterior Analytics, Bk. I, ch. 2. Cf. also Metaphysics, Bk. II, text 4 (or in the shorter version, Bk. I, ch. 1). — In which text very many codices at *each one* [unumquodque] reads *each such* [unumquodque tale]. Then near the end of the argument, with the help of the manuscripts and the first editions, we have restored *He has* [habet].
[6] Book on Causes, proposition 1, in which text very many codices, such as B D E F G M X etc. together with editions 2 and 3, falsely have *prior* [plus] in place of *more* [plus].
[7] Chapter 2; where the words of (St.) Augustine are also had. — One or the other of the codices, such as Y and Z, have *Master (Peter) says* [Magister dicit] in place of *is said* [dicitur].

---

p. 222

san- / -ctus habet a Patre quod sit, et quod procedat a Patre et Filio:[1] a Filio autem non habet, quod procedat a Patre, quia tunc Filius daret aliquid Patri: ergo etc.

Contra: 1. Si *plenius* a Patre, ergo

has from the Father what He is, and that He proceeds from the Father and the Son:[1] but from the Son He does not have, that He proceeds from the Father, because then the Son would give something to the Father: ergo etc..

On the contrary: 1. If *more fully* from the

perfectius: ergo a Filio non procedit perfectissime, ergo in Trinitate est aliquid imperfectionis.

Father, therefore more perfectly: therefore He does not proceed from the Son most perfectly, therefore in the Trinity there is something of imperfection.

2. Item, si plenius a Patre quam a Filio, plus accipit a Patre quam a Filio; sed ubi est ponere plus et minus, ibi est diversitas: ergo in persona Spiritus sancti est diversitas.

2. Likewise, if (He proceeds) more fully from the Father than from the Son, He accepts more from the Father than from the Son; but where there is a positing of "more and less", there there is a diversity: therefore in the Person of the Holy Spirit there is a diversity.

3. Item, videtur quod nec *principalius* a Patre, quia qui perfecte dat aliquid alicui, dat ei usum[2] et iursdictionem sive auctoritatem; si ergo dat Pater Filio posse spirare, ergo dat ei auctoritatem spirandi: ergo aeque principaliter procedit a Filio ut a Patre.[3]

3. Likewise, it seems that (He proceeds) neither *more principally* from the Father, because he who perfectly gives anything to anyone, gives him use[2] and jurisdiction or authority [auctoritatem]; if, therefore, the Father gives to the Son that He is able to spirate, therefore He gives Him an authorship [auctoritatem] of spirating: therefore He proceeds equally principally from the Son as from the Father.[3]

CONCLUSIO.

In sano sensu dici potest, Spiritum sanctum procedere a Patre principaliter vel principalius et per se; non tamen procedit plenius nec perfectius.

CONCLUSION

In a sane sense it can be said, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father principally and or more principally and per se; He does not, however, proceed more fully, nor more perfectly.

R**ESPONDEO**: Dicendum, quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur procedere[4] a Patre *principaliter* et *per se*: principaliter, quia auctoritas est in Patre; per se, quia non tantum mediante Filio, sed etiam immediate. Non tamen *plenius* procedit a Patre nec *perfectius*, quia *plenius* ponit gradum perfectionis, ponit etiam compositionem substantiae in producto, quorum neutrum est in divinis. Unde si proponatur haec: quod illud quod procedit ab aliquo principalius, procedit plenius, simpliciter est neganda.[5]

I **RESPOND:** It must be said, that the Holy Spirit is said to proceed[4] from the Father *principally* and *per se*: principally, because (His) authorship [auctoritas] is in the Father; per se, because not only with the Son as a means, but also immediately (from Himself). However, He does not proceed *more fully* from the Father nor *more perfectly*, because *more fully* posits a grade a perfection, (and) it also posits a composition of the substance in the one produced, neither of which are among the divine. Whence if this is proposed: 'that that which proceeds from something more principally, proceeds more fully', it simply is to be denied.[5]

1. 2. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur de causa prima et *propter quod* etc.; dicendum, quod sicut dictum est prius,[6] illud solum habet locum, ubi pluralitas causarum est; hic autem non est pluralitas nec causarum nec principiorum: ideo non habet hic locum.

1. 2. To that which is, therefore, objected concerning a first cause and a *that on account of which* etc.; it must be said, that just as has been said before,[6] that only has a place, where there is a plurality of causes; but here there is not a plurality, neither of causes, nor of principles: for that reason it does not have a place here.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod non habet Spiritus sanctus a Filio, quod procedat a

4. To that which is objected, that the Holy Spirit does not have from the Son, that He

Patre; dicendum ad hoc, quod habere a se vel ab alio non ponit gradum plenitudinis. Unde quamvis Filius divinitatem habeat a Patre, ita[7] tamen est perfectus Deus ut Pater; et ideo non sequitur, quod *plenius* a Patre procedat, quia *principalius*. — Quod[8] obiicitur: plenius habet quod habet essentiam et proprietatem; responderi potest interimendo *minorem*; habet enim Spiritus sanctus a Filio proprietatem, licet non habet secundum omnem respectum; habet enim processionem a Filio, sed non ut a Patre.

proceeds from the Father; it must be said regarding this, that "to have from one's self and/or from an other" does not posit a grade of plenitude. Whence, although the Son has (His) Divinity from the Father, thus[7] nevertheless He is the perfect God as the Father; and for that reason it does not follow, that (the Holy Spirit) proceeds *more fully* from the Father, because (He proceeds) *more principally*. — (To that) which[8] is objected: one has more fully because he has essence and property; it can be responded by denying *the minor*; for the Holy Spirit has from the Son a property, though He does not have (it) according to every respect; for He has (His) Procession from the Son, but not as (He does) from the Father.

Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Pater dat Filio auctoritatem; dicendum quod dando auctoritatem super Spiritum sanctum, nihilominus ex ipso habet auctoritatem,[9] quia ex hoc debet Filius eam referre ad Patrem, quia habet a Patre; et inde est, quod in Filio est auctoritas et subauctoritas. Unde etiam principaliter producit Spiritum sanctum,[10] sed Pater principalius, quia in eo est tantum auctoritas, non subauctoriats. *Principalitas* autem dicitur *auctoritas* in divinis.

To that which is objected, that the Father gives authority [auctoritatem] to the Son; it must be said that while giving authority over the Holy Spirit, nevertheless He has the authority from Himself,[9] because from this ought the Son refer it to the Father, because He has (it) from the Father; and hence it is, that in the Son there is an authorship and a sub-authorship [subauctoritas]. Whence He also principally produces the Holy Spirit,[10] but the Father more principally, because in Him there is only authorship, not sub-authorship. Moreover the *quality of being a beginning* [principalitas] is said (to be) *the quality of being an author* [auctoritas] among the divine.

SCHOLION.

I. Quo sensu hic intelligenda sint vocabula *plenius*, *principaliter*, *auctoritas*, *subauctoritas*, satis apparet ex ipsis verbis S. Doctoris, hic et infra dub. 3. positis. Negatur, quod Spiritus sanctus *plenius* procedat a Patre quam a Filio, quia hic terminus significat gradus perfectionis, vel saltem connotat compositionem in aliquo; affirmatur vero, quod *principalius* Pater producat Spiritum sanctum, in sensu et ex ratione in q. 1. expressis. Filium* autem *principaliter* Spiritum sanctum producere asseritur, quia dat ei quidquid habet, unde dicitur habere *auctoritatem* respectu eiusdem, *subauctoritatem* vero respectu Patris, a quo omnia habet. Habere igitur *auctoritatem* et *principalitatem* nostro Doctori idem est. Unde in fine solut. ad 4.

SCHOLIUM

I. In what sense here are to be understood the words *plenius*, *principaliter*, *auctoritas*, *subauctoritas*, is sufficiently apparent from the words themselves of the Seraphic Doctor, posited here and below in dubium 3. It is denied, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *more fully* [plenius] from the Father than from the Son, because this term signifies a grade of perfection; and/or at least connotes a composition in something; on the other hand it is affirmed, that the Father does *more principally* [principalius] produce the Holy Spirit, in the sense and for the reason expressed in q. 1. Moreover it is asserted that the Son* *principally* [principaliter] produces the Holy Spirit, because He gives Him whatever He has, wherefore He is said to have an *authorship*

respondet « interimendo » i. e. ut falsam negando minorem. — Hunc modum dicendi, quod Pater principalius producat Filium, S. Doctor, Magistrum aliosque antiquos theologos secutus, non reprobat. Immerito nonnulli moderni theologi cum . . .

[auctoratem] in respect of the Same, a *sub-authorship* [subauctoritatem], however, in respect of the Father, from whom He has everything. Therefore to have *authorship* and *the quality of being a beginning* [principalitas] is the same thing for our Doctor. Whence at the end of the solution to n. 4, he responds by « interemption », i. e., by denying the false minor. — This manner of speaking, that the Father produces the Son more principally, the Seraphic Doctor, following Master (Peter) and the other ancient theologians, does not reprove. Undeservedly do not a few modern theologians together with . . .

---

* Hic textus scholionis perperam *Filius* pro *Filium*, quod *asseritur* requirit locutioni indirectae.

[1] Multi codd. cum edd. 2, 3 forte ex eo, quod eadem verba immediate post occurunt, indebite omittunt *et Filio*, e contra cod. R omittit *Patre et*, cum quo conveniunt codd. aa bb legendo *et procedat etiam a Filio*; lectio non spernenda. Mox post *non habet, quod* cod. Y bene addit *a Patre sit et*.

[2] Emendavimus lectionem Vat. et cod. cc ex aliis mss. et ed. 1 ponendo *usum* pro *vim*.

[3] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 ordinem argumentorum invertit, ponendo ultimum hoc argumentum quinto loco inter argumenta ad oppositum, licet in margine etiam respectu ipsius habeat: Fundamenta. Ratio huius inversionis videtur fuisse, quod hoc argumentum partem conclusionis neget, scil. quod Spiritus sanctus *principalius* a Patre procedat. Sed melius cum codd. hoc argumentum, licet sub aliquo respectu ad oppositum pertineat, ultimo loco ponitur, quia est argumentum speciale seu sui generis, scil. negans, quod Spiritus sanctus *principalius* a Patre procedat, dum cetera argumenta vel probant vel negant, quod Spiritus sanctus *plenius* a Patre procedat.

[4] Unus alterve codd. ut W Y *procedit* loco *dicitur procedere*.

[5] Multi codd., ordine inverso, *quod procedit ab aliquo plenius, procedit principalius*. Licet utraque lectio, attentis definitionibus terminorum, in se vera sit, attamen unus terminus verificatur in divinis, alter non, et attento ordine terminorum inter se, praeferenda videtur lectio in textum recepta, quae iam in pluribus antiquis mss. ut H L O et ed. 1 invenitur. Cfr. resp. ad 4. — Vat. contra mss.et ed. 1 *ponatur* loco *proponatur* et post *plenius* addit *aut si non plenius, neque principalius*. Codd. H Y post *haec* addunt *quaestio*, sed melius subintelligendum: propositio, quod procedat principalius.

[6] Quaest. praeced. ad 1.

[7] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus non bene omissum *ita*. Concordat Anselm, de Process. Spir. sanct. c. 24.

[8] Pauci codd. ut H S ee *Ad illud quod*.

[9] Codd. L O adiiciunt *super Spiritum sanctum*.

[10] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6

* Here the latin text of the scholium faultily reads *the Son* [Filius] in the nominative, because the indirect construction requires rather then accusative.

[1] Many codices, together with editions 2 and 3, perhaps from this, that the same words immediately occurs after this, unduly omit *and the Son* [et Filio], and contrariwise codex R omits *the Father and* [Patre et], with which codices aa and bb agree, by reading *and He proceeds also from the Son* [et procedat etiam a Filio]; a reading not to be spurned. Then after *He does not have, that* [non habet, quod], codex Y does well to add *He is from the Father and* [a Patre sit et].

[2] We have emended the reading of the Vatican edition and codex cc, from the other manuscripts and edition 1, by putting *use* [usum] in place of *force* [vim].

[3] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, inverts the order of the arguments, by placing this argument last in the fifth place among the arguments for the opposite, though in the margin it has also this reference: Fundament. The reason for this inversion seems to have been, that this argument denies part of the conclusion, namely that the Holy Spirit proceeds *more principally* from the Father. But it is better that, together with the codices, this argument, though it pertains in another respect to the arguments for the opposite, be placed in the last place, because it is a special argument, or a sui generis one, namely, one denying, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *more principally* from the Father, while all the other arguments either prove or deny, that the Holy Spirit proceeds *more fully* from the Father. [Trans. note: In regard to the use of *auctoritas* in this argument and at the end of the responses: Latin has but one term for *authority* and *authorship*, and hence its use in the argument confounds both senses, that of being a beginning and that of having the right to govern. In the English translation some of this confusion is dispelled by using each term according to the sense of the context, which helps clarify the error of Suarez et alia who criticize the Seraphic Doctor's argument here regarding *that the Holy Spirit proceeds more principally from the Father*, cf. Scholium below, part

Filium pro *Spiritum sanctum*.

I: which justifies this distinction of two senses.]
[4] One or the other of the codices, such as W and Y, have *proceed* in place of *is said to proceed* [dicitur procedere].
[5] Many codices, with the order reversed, have *that which proceeds from something more fully, proceeds more principally*. Though each reading, having attended to the definition of terms, is true in itself, however one term is verified among the divine, the other is not, and having attend to the order of terms among themselves, it seems that the reading received in the text is to be preferred, which is already found in very many of the ancient manuscripts, such as H L O and edition 1. Cf. response to n. 4. — The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, has *is posited* [ponatur] in place of *is proposed* [proponatur] , and after *more fully* adds *or if not more fully, neither more principally* [aut si non plenius, neque principalius]. Codices H and Y after *this* [haec] add *question* [quaestio], but it is better that there be understood: this *proposition, that He proceeds more principally*.
[6] In the preceding question, in reply to n. 1.
[7] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied the not well omitted *thus* [ita]. (St.) Anselm agrees in his Procession of the Holy Spirit, ch. 24.
[8] A few codices, such as H S and ee, read *To that which* [Ad illud quod].
[9] Codices L and O insert *over the Holy Spirit* [super Spiritum sanctum].
[10] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, and 6, has *the Son* [Filium] for *the Holy Spirit* [Spiritum Sanctum].

Suarez hanc locutionem Seraphici tanquam erroneam reiiciunt. Attendere enim debuissent, ipsum S. Doctorem eam explicasse in sensu certe orthodoxo nec eam commendasse, sed sane explicatum solummodo tolerasse, uti apparet ex ultima propositoine in corp.

Suarez reject this saying of the Seraphic (Doctor) as erroneous. For they ought to attended (to the fact), that the Seraphic Doctor has explained it in a certainly orthodox sense, nor has he commended it, but only tolerated what is sanely explained, as is apparent from the last proposition in the body (of the response).

Ad 3. oppositum non respondetur explicite, quia iam solutum est in corp. Quo sensu dici possit, quod Spiritus sanctus *proprie* a Patre procedit, cfr. infra dub. 3.

To the third counter-objection there is no explicit response, because it has already been solved in the body (of the response). In which sense it can be said, that the Holy Spirit *properly* proceeds from the Father, cf. below dubium 3.

II. Quoad conclusionem cfr. S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2; S. I. q. 36. a. 3. ad 2. — B. Albert., hic a. 3. 4. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 2. — Richard. a. Med., hic q. 2. — Aegid. R., 2. princ. q. 1. — Durand., hic q. 2.

II. In regard to the conclusion, cf. St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2;* Summa , I, q. 36, a. 3, ad 2. — Bl. (now) St. Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 3 and 4. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 2. — Richard of Middletown, here in q. 2. — Giles the

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

Quaestio III.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 223-224.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XII

ARTICLE SOLE

Question 3

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 223-224.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO III.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus mediante Filio a Patre procedat.

Tertio quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus procedat a Patre mediante Filio.

1. Et quod sic, videtur per Hilarium duodecimo de Trinitate,[1] qui loquens ad Patrem ait: « Spiritum sanctum, qui ex te per eum est, promerear »: ergo Spiritus sanctus est a Patre per Filium, ergo mediante Filio.

QUESTION 3

Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by means of the Son.

Third it is asked, whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by means of the Son.

1. That that (it is) so, seems through (St.) Hilary (of Poitiers) in the twelfth (book) On the Trinity,[1] who speaking to the Father says: « May I deserve the Holy Spirit, who is from [ex] Thee through Him »: therefore the Holy Spirit is from the Father through

the Son, therefore by means of the Son.

2. Item, Richardus[2] dicit, quod in divinis est processio immediata tantum, et mediata et immediata — mediata tantum esse non potest — et dicit, quod mediata et immediata est processio Spiritus sancti ex Patre: ergo cum non possit cadere medium nisi Filius, Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre mediante Filio.

2. Likewise, Richard (of St. Victor)[2] says, that among the divine there is a procession only immediate, and one mediate and immediate — one only mediate there cannot be — and he says, that the one mediate and immediate is the procession of the Holy Spirit out of the Father: therefore since a medium cannot occur (There) except the Son, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by means of the Son.

3. Item, similis est processus in illa Trinitate processui imaginis creatae;[3] sed amor procedit a mente mediante intelligentia: ergo Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre mediante Filio. *Si dicas*, quod non est similitudo quantum ad hoc: ergo destruitur ratio imaginis, quia *imago* debet repraesentare ordinem et origniem personarum, non tantum numerum in personis, quia hoc[4] etiam est in *vestigio*.

3. Likewise, similar is the processing in that Trinity to the processing in the created image;[3] but love proceeds from the mind by means of understanding [intelligentia]: therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by means of the Son. *If you say*, that there is not a similitude as much as regards this: therefore the reckoning of the image is destroyed, because an *image* ought to represent the order and origin of the Persons, not only the number among the Persons, because this[4] is also in the *vestige*.

4. Item, si solus Filius spiraret,[5] ita quod non Pater, tunc Pater diceretur spirare, sed mediante Filio, ita quod esset processio mediata tantum: ergo cum spiratio conveniat Patri per se et conveniat ei per hoc, quod est principium Filii spirantis, ergo convenit ei et mediate et immediate; sed si hoc,[6] Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre mediante Filio.

4. Likewise, if the Son alone spirates,[5] so that the Father (does) not, then the Father would be said to spirate, but by means of the Son, so that there would be only a mediated procession: therefore since spiration befits the Father per se and befits Him through this, that He is the principle of the Son spirating, therefore it befits Him both mediately and immediately; and if this,[6] the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father by means of the son.

Contra: 1. Nobilius est immediatum principium, quam mediatum; sed omne nobilius est Deo tribuendum:[7] ergo si Pater est nobilissimum principium Spiritus sancti, ergo tantum immediate, non mediate producit ipsum. *Si tu dicas*, quod producit simul mediate et immediate; *contra*: mediatum et immediatum sunt opposita; sed opposita non sunt simul vera de eodem et respectu eiusdem:[8] ergo impossibile est, quod simul producat mediate et immediate.

On the contrary: 1. More noble is an immediate principle, than a mediate one; but everything more noble is to be attributed to God:[7] therefore if the Father is a most noble principle of the Holy Spirit, therefore He produces Him only immediately, not mediately. *If you say*, that He produces at once mediately and immediately; *on the contrary*, the mediate and immediate are opposites; but opposites are not at the same time true of the same and in respect of the same:[8] therefore it is impossible, that He produces at once mediately and immediately.

2. Item, sicut se habet *per se* ad *per accidens*, ita *mediatum* ad *immediatum*; sed Deus nullius, cuius est causa per se, et causa per accidens: ergo nullius, cuius est principium immediatum, est principium

2. Likewise, just as *per se* holds itself to *per accidens*, so *the mediate* to *the immediate*; but God is a cause *per accidens* of nothing, of which He is the cause per se: therefore of nothing, of which He is an immediate

mediatum.

3. Item, magis est immediatum quod nullo modo recipit medium, quam quod recipit medium; sed Filius nullum medium recipit in spirando: ergo immediatius producit, quam producat Pater: non ergo uniformiter omnino producunt Pater et Filius Spiritum sanctum.

principle, is He a mediate principle.

3. Likewise, (a thing) is more immediate, which in no manner receives a medium, than that which receives a medium; but the Son receives no medium in spirating: therefore more immediately does He produce, than does the Father produce: therefore not entirely uniformly does the Father and the Son produce the Holy Spirit.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre tum immediate, tum mediante Filio.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father both immediately, and by means of the Son.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut vult Richardus, productio[9] Spiritus sancti est *mediata* simul et *immediata*: mediata, in quantum est a Filio, et Filius a Patre; sed immediata, in quantum ipse Spiritus sanctus ab ipso Patre spiratur.

I respond: It must be said, that, just as Richard (of St. Victor) wants, the production[9] of the Holy Spirit is at once *mediate* and *immediate*: mediate, inasmuch as He is from the Son, and the Son from the Father; but immediate, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is Himself spirated from the Father Himself.

Et huius exemplum ponitur in exitu Abel de Adam. Abel enim[10] immediate exiit de Adam, quia ipse ex lumbis suis genuit eum; nihilominus exiit mediate, quia exiit ab Eva, quae fuit ab Adam sive de Adam deducta. Et hunc modum oportuit esse in Deo propter summam germanitatem. Si enim tantum mediata esset processio Spiritus sancti, ut tantum esset a Filio, non esset summa germanitas Spiritus sancti cum Patre. Similiter, si omnino immediata, ut esset a Patre tantum, non esset summa germanitas cum Filio. Et sic concedendum,[11] quod mediate Filio.

And an example of this is posited in the going-forth [exitu] of Abel from [de] Adam. For[10] Abel went forth immediately from Adam, because the latter begot him from [ex] his own loins; nevertheless he went forth mediately, because he went forth from [a] Eve, who was from Adam or drawn from Adam [de Adam deducta]. And it was opportune that this manner (of procession) be in God on account of (His) most high kinship [germanitatem]. For if there were only a mediated procession of the Holy Spirit, as would be only from the Son, there would not be a most high kinship of the Holy Spirit with the Father. Similarly, if (it were) entirely immediate, as would be only from the Father, there would not be a most high kinship with the Son. And in this manner it must be conceded,[11] that (He proceeds) by means of the Son.

1. Ad illud ergo[12] quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod nobilius est immediatum principium; dicendum, quod mediatio est tribus modis. *Quaedam* enim est mediatio, quae excludit immediationem tantum, ut quando effectus ultimus non continuatur influentiae . . .

1. To that, therefore,[12] which is objected in the contrary, that more noble is an immediate principle; it must be said, that there is mediation in three manners. For *a certain* (kind) is the mediation, which excludes only immediation, as when the last effect is not united in an unbroken manner [non continuatur] to the influence . . .

---

[1] In fine. Vide lit. Magistri, c. 2.
[2] Libr. V. de Trin. c. 7-9.
[3] De imagine crata vide supra d. 3. p. II. praesertim a. 2. q. 2. et 3.

[1] At the end. See (here) the text of Master (Peter), ch. 2.
[2] On the Trinity, Bk. V, chs. 7-9.
[3] On the created image see above d. 3, p. II,

[4] Fide mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *hoc* pro *haec*, quod Vat. perperam ponit. Sub *hoc* intellige: repraesentare numerum.
[5] Ex pluribus mss. ut I aa bb et ed. 1 mutavimus *spirat* in *spiraret*, quod subnexis magis congruit. Mox post *tunc Pater* ed. 1 addit *non*.
[6] In ed. 1 additur *ergo*.
[7] Unus alterve codex ut Y cc *attribuendum*.
[8] Vide Aristot., XI. Metaph. c. 4 (X. c. 5.), et de Praedicam. c. de Oppositis.
[9] Cod. E *processio*.
[10] Vat., plurimis mss. et ed. 1 refragantibus, omittit *enim*. — De hoc exemplo vide Richard. a S. Vict., V. de Trin. c. 6.
[11] Cod. V addit *est*; cod. O autem post *quod* adiungit *procedit*.
[12] Ope plurium mss. ut A F W etc. et ed. 1 supplevimus *ergo*.

especially a. 2, q. 2 and 3.
[4] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *this* [hoc] for *this (similitude)* [haec], which the Vatican edition faultily put there. Under the term "*this*" understand: the representation of number [repraesentare numerum].
[5] From very many manuscripts, such as I aa bb and edition 1, we have changed *spirates* from the indicative to the subjunctive, because this is more congruous with what is subjoined. Then after *the Father would* [tunc Pater] edition 1 adds *not* [non].
[6] In edition 1 there is added *therefore* [ergo].
[7] One or the other codex, such as Y and cc, have *attributed* [attribuendum].
[8] See Aristotle, Metaphysics, Bk XI, ch. 4 (Bk. X, ch. 5), and On the Predicaments, ch. on Opposites.
[9] Codex E has *procession* [processio].
[10] The Vatican edition, disagreeing with very many manuscripts and edition 1, omits *For* [enim]. — On this example, see Richard of St. Victor, On the Trinity, Bk. V, ch. 6.
[11] Codex V adds the presumed *it must* [est].
[12] With the help of very many manuscripts, such as A F W etc. and edition 1, we have supplied *therefore* [ergo].

---

causae prioris, sed per medium omnino producitur, priori non cooperante;[1] et haec dicit *ordinem* et *diversitatem* agentium et *separationem*. *Alio modo* dicitur mediatio, prout dicit *ordinem* causarum ad invicem, non *separationem* in agendo, sed solum *diversitatem* agentium[2] et ordinem. *Tertio modo*, prout dicit *ordinem*, non tamen *separationem* virtutum agentium nec *diversitatem*.

of the prior cause, but is produced entirely through a medium, with the prior not cooperating;[1] and this (signification of "mediation") means the *order* and *diversity* and *separation* of the agents. *In another manner* "mediation" is said, insofar as it means the *order* of the causes to each other, not (their) *separation* in acting, but only the *diversity* and order of the agents.[2] *In the third manner*, insofar as it means *order*, not however the *separation* of the virtues of the agents nor (their) *diversity*.

Prima mediatio non cadit in Deo, quia Deus est causa simpliciter prima, cuius influentia est tanta, quod nulla creatura aliquid agit, eius influentia remota; et ideo nihil a[3] Deo exit mediate tantum. *Secunda* mediatio cadit in Deo respectu effectus producti a causa creata, quia ibi est *ordo* causarum et *diversitats* virtutum; et tamen non est *separatio*, quia Deus intime agit, quia per se ipsum; agit[4] nihilominus per virtutem creatam, quae ab ipso est. *Tertia* mediatio cadit in operatione divina, in qua sunt agentes personae, in quibus attenditur *ordo*, quia una habet ab alia quod agat, sed tamen nec est ibi virtutum *diversitas* nec *separatio* vel distantia aliqua, immo una virtute et aeque intime agunt. Et sic Pater

The *first* mediation does not occur in God, because God is the simply first cause, the influence of whom is so great, that no creature does anything, removed from His influence; and for that reason nothing goes forth from[3] God only mediately. The *second* mediation occurs in God in respect of an effect produced by a created cause, because there is an *order* of causes and a *diversity* of virtues there; and yet there is not a *separation*, because God acts most interiorly, because it (exists) through Himself; nevertheless He acts[4] through the created virtue, which is from it. The *third* mediation occurs in the divine operation, in which the Persons are agents, in which there is attained an *order*, because One has

mediante Filio producit Spiritum sanctum, non quia sit medium distantiae vel differentiae, sed quia, quod Filius producat, hoc habet a Patre, ita quod est ibi quidam ordo. Et sic patet responsio ad sequens, cum dicit, quod mediatum et immediatum sunt opposita; verum est enim primo modo, sed non secundo nec tertio.[5]

from the Other that He acts, but yet neither is there There a *diversity* of virtues nor a *separation* and/or any distance, nay They act by one virtue and equally most interiorly. And in this manner the Father produces by means of the Son the Holy Spirit, not because there is a medium of distance and/or a difference, but because, ‘that the Son produces’, He has this from the Father, so that There there is a certain order. And thus is clear the response to the following, when he says, that the mediate and immediate are opposites; for it is true in the first manner, but not in the second nor in the third.[5]

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod Deus nullius est causa per accidens, ergo nec mediate; dicendum quod *per accidens aliquid causare* derogat veritati[6] causae supremae. Illius enim dicitur aliquid causa esse per accidens, cuius est causa per aliquid aliud, quod non est ab ipso, sed aliunde; si ergo Deus alicuius esset causa per accidens, non esset causa universalissima et prima, et ita nec nobilissima. Sed[7] *mediatio* non repugnat nobilitate causae supremae. Causare enim aliquid[8] *per se* et per id quod ab *ipso est* non dicit indignitatem, immo dignitatem, quia dignitas est non tantum per se aliquid posse, sed posse alii communicare, ita tamen quod ille sine eo nihil possit.

2. To that which is objected, that of nothing is God a cause per accidens, therefore neither mediately; it must be said that *to cause anything per accidens* derogates from the truth[6] of the supreme Cause. For something is said to be the cause per accidens of that, of which it is the cause through something else, which is not from it, but from another; if therefore God would be the cause of anything per accidens, He would not be the most universal and first cause, and thus neither the most noble. But[7] mediation is not repugnant to the nobility of the supreme Cause. For to cause anything[8] *per se* and through that which *is from itself* does not mean an indignity, nay dignity, because dignity is not only to be able (to do) something per se, but to be able to communicate to another, however so that the latter can do nothing without it.

3. Ad illud quod ultimo obicitur, quod Filius est immediatior cause; dicendum, quod non valet, quia ista mediatio, quae praedicta est, non repugnat immediationi, et ideo non diminuit eam.

3. To that which is objected last, that the Son is a more immediate cause; it must be said, that (that argument) is not valid, because that mediation, which the aforesaid is, is not repugnant to immediation, and for that reason does not diminish it.

SCHOLION.

I. Pro elucidatione huius quaestionis servire potest quod dicit Petr. a Tar. (hic q. 1. a. 3): « Respiciendo ad principium *quo* spirant, aeque immediate procedit Spiritus sanctus a Patre, sicut a Filio; respiciendo ad ipsos *spirantes*, similiter aeque immediate procedit a Patre, sicut a Filio, sed nihilominus etiam *mediate* procedit a Patre, quia non solum per se spirat, sed etiam mediante Filio ».

SCHOLIUM

I. What (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise says (here in q. 1, a. 3) can be useful for the elucidation of this question « In looking back to the principle *by which* They spirate, the Holy Spirit proceeds equally immediately from the Father, as from the Son; in looking back to Those *spirating*, similarly He proceeds equally immediately from the Father, as from the Son, but nevertheless He proceeds *mediately* from the Father, because He spires not only through Himself, but also by means of the

Son ».

II. Locutio: *procedere mediante Filio* in eodem sensu explicatur a S. Thom. (S. I. q. 36. a. 3. ad 1. 2.). — Tres modi mediationis, qui in solut. ad 1. occurunt, exemplis magis illustrari possunt. Primi modi exemplus est avus, qui est causa tantum mediata filiorum sui fili; et sic *mediate* et *immediate* contradictorie oppountur, nec talis mediatio Deo tribui potest. Secundi modi exemplum in ipso textu adducitur, scil. cooperatio Dei cum actibus creaturarum. Deus enim sic operatur mediantibus causis secundis, ut tamen ista mediatio non excludat immediatam operationm divinam, qua intime attingit et causam secundam et effectum eius; sic sumtum *mediatum* et *immediatum* non opponuntur. Tertius modus mediationis respicit tantum *ordinem* divinarum personarum ad invicem, sive attendatur in operibus divinis ad extra, quae sunt indivisa, et datur in spiratione Spiritus sancti, in qua est ordo spirantium.

II. The saying: *to proceed by means of the Son* is explained in the same sense by St. Thomas (Summa, I, q. 36, a. 3, ad 1 and 2). — The tree manners of mediation, which occur in the solution to n. 1, can be illustrated with more examples. An example of the first manner is the grandfather, who is only a mediated cause of the sons of his own son; and in this manner *mediately* and *immediately* are contradictorially opposed, nor can such a mediation be attributed to God. An example of the second manner is adduced in the text itself, namely, the cooperation of god with the acts of creatures. For God so works by means of second causes, yet so that that mediation does not exclude the immediate divine operation, by which He touches [attingit] most interiorly both the second cause and its effect; taken in this manner the *mediate* and *immediate* are not opposed. The third manner of mediation respects only the *order* of the divine Persons to each Other, or is attained in the divine works ad extra, which are undivided, and (the former) is given in the spiration of the Holy Spirit, in which there is a order of the Ones spirating.

III. Circa id quod dicit ad 2, Deum non esse causam per accidens, cfr. II. Sent. d. 37. q. 2. a. 2, ubi dicit: Causa per accidens dicitur respectu intentionis, non quatenus accidens est differentia entis.

III. About that which he said at n. 2, that God is not a cause per accidens, cf. Sent., Bk. II, d. 37, q. 2, a. 2, (in reply to n. 4), where he says: A cause per accidens is said in respect of an intention, not to the extent that an accident is a difference of a being.

IV. Quoad conclusionem: Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 45. m. 6. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 3; S. I. q. 36. a. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. unic. a. 3. — Richard. a Med., hic q. 3. — Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 2. — Durand, hic q. 3.

IV. In regard to the conclusion: Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 45, m 6. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 3; Summa, I, q. 36, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. sole, a. 3. — Richard of Middletown, here in q. 3. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 2. — Durandus, here in q. 3.

---

[1] Cod. A *operante*. Ed. 1 paulo infra post *Alio modo* habet *est* pro *dicitur*.

[2] Auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 expunximus *virtutum*, quod Vat. praemittit verbo *agentium*. Mox post *Tertio modo* cod. X repetit *dicitur mediatio*.

[3] Fide mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *a* loco *ex*.

[4] Vat., interpunctione mutate, refert verbum *agit* ad *per se ipsum*, atque deinde adiungit *et*, sed mss. obnitentibus; ed 1 loco *et* bene repetit *agit*; cod. F minus bene post *nihilominus* addit *est actio*, insuper *secundum* ponit pro *per*.

---

[1] Codex A has *operating* [operante]. Edition 1 a little below this, after *In another manner* [Alio modo], has *is* [est] in place of *is said* [dicitur].

[2] On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the *of the virtues* [virtutum], which the Vatican edition prefixed to the words *of the agents* [agentium]. Then after *In the third manner* codex X repeats *mediation is said* [dicitur mediatio].

[3] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *from* [a] for *out of* [ex].

[5] Varii codd. varie legunt; cod. F loco *enim* ponit *sed*; cod H. post *enim* addit *aliquo modo scilicet*; multi codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 mendose *verum est enim, sed non primo modo sed secundo vel tertio*; cod. T incomplete *verum est enim, sed non cadit mediatio in Deo primo modo, sed secundo vel tertio*, quae lectio a posteriore manu mutata est in eam quam habet Vaticana. Coniectamus, lectionem genuinam esse: *verum est enim primo modo; sed non cadit meditatio in Deo primo modo, sed secundo vel tertio*, qua lectione et codices reconciliantur.
[6] In cod. H additur *et nobilitati*; in cod. T a secundo manu nomen *veritati* mutatum est in *universalitati*. — De *causa per se* et *per accidens* cfr. Aristot., II. Phys. text. 50. (c. 5.), ubi ait: Ut enim et ens, aliud quidem per se est, aliud autem secundum accidens; sic et causam contingit esse, ut ipsius domus per se quidem causa est aedificativum, secundum accidens autem album aut musicam. Itaque per se causa, definita est; quae vero secundum accidens, indefinita; infinita enim uni accidunt. Sicut igitur dictum est, cum in iis, quae propter aliquid (finem) fiunt, hoc fiat, tunc dicitur a causa et a fortuna.
[7] Pauci codd. ut V X Z addunt *haec*; cod. Y melius post *mediatio* adiungit *quae in Deo ponitur*.
[8] Ex antiquioribus mss. et edd. 1, 6 substituimus *aliquid* loco *aliud*. Mox aliquid codd. ut B T X *illud* pro *id*, et paulo infra cod. Y cum ed. 1 *dignitatis* loco *dignitas*.

[4] The Vatican edition, with changed punctuation, refers the verb *acts* to the previous phrase, rendering it as *it acts through Himself* [per se ipsum agit], and then inserting an and [et], but against the manuscripts; edition 1 in place of *and* [et] repeats well enough *acts* [agit]; codex F less well after *nevertheless* [nihilominus] adds *there is an action* [est actio], and moreover puts *according to* [secundum] in place of the *through* [per] which follows.
[5] Varius codices read variously; codex F in place of *for* [enim] has *but* [sed]; codex H after *for* [enim] adds *in some manner, that is* [aliquot modo scilicet]; many codices, together with editions 1, 2 and 3, erroneously read *for it is true, but not in the first manner but in the second and/or third* [verum est enim, sed non primo modo sed secundo vel tertio]; codex T reads incompletely *for it is true, but mediation does not occur in God in the first manner, but in the second and/or third* [verum est enim, sed non cadit mediatio in Deo primo modo, sed secundo vel tertio], which reading has been changed by a later hand into that which the Vatican edition has. We conjecture that the genuine reading is: *for it is true in the first manner; but mediation does not occur in God in the first manner, but in the second and/or third*, by which reading the codices are also reconciled.
[6] In Codex H there is adds *and the nobility* [et nobilitati]; in codex T by a second hand the noun *truth* [veritati] has been changed into *universality* [universalitati]. — On a *cause per se* and *per accidens*, cf. Aristotle, Physics, Bk. II, text 50 (ch. 5), where he says: For as even a being [ens], is indeed one (thing) per se, but another according to accident; so it also happens to be, that his house per se is indeed a cause of the building process [causa aedificativum *read as* causa aedificativa], but according to accident white or decorated. And thus as a per se cause, it is definite, which, however, according to accident, is indefinite; for infinite (accidents) accede to one (being). Therefore just as has been said, when among those, which come into being for the sake of any (end), there comes to be this, then it is said (by the common man to be) by cause and by chance.
[7] A few codices, such as V X and Z, add *this* [haec]; codex Y, better, adds after *mediation* adds *which is posited in God* [quae in Deo ponitur].
[8] From the more ancient manuscripts and editions 1 and 6, we have substituted *anything* [aliquid] for *another* [aliud]. Then some codices, such as B T and Z, have *that* [illud] for *that* [id], and a little below this codex Y together with edition 1 has *of dignity* [dignitatis] for *dignity* [dignitas].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

PRIMI LIBRI

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XII.

ARTICULUS UNICUS.

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XII

ARTICLE SOLE

Quaestio IV.

Question 4

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 225-226.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 225-226.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUAESTIO IV.

Utrum generatio Filii sit prior spiratione Spiritus sancti secundum rationem intelligendi.

QUESTION 4

Whether the generation of the Son is prior to the generation of the Holy Spirit, according to the reckoning of understanding.

Q**UARTO ET ULTIMO** quaeritur, quae istarum duarum emanationum, scilicet generationis et processionis, sit prior secundum rationem intelligendi. Et quod generatio Filii, ostenditur sic.

F**OURTH AND LAST** there is asked, which of those two emanations, that is, generation and procession, is prior according to the reckoning of understanding. And that the generation of the Son (is), is shown in this manner:

1. In imagine creata sic est, quod secundum ordinem intelligendi prior est emanatio notitiae a mente quam amoris, sicut vult Augustinus;[1] « quia incognita non possumus diligere », sicut dicit Augustinus in decimo de Trinitate:[2] ergo si ordo attenditur in imagine secundum conformitatem ad Trinitatem increatam, ergo secundum rationem intelligendi prior est processus Verbi quam amoris in divinis, maxime cum per imaginem creatam intelligamus

1. In the created image thus it is, that according to the order of understanding the emanation of knowledge [notitiae] from the mind is before (that) of love [amoris], just as (St.) Augustine wants it;[1] « because we cannot love [diligere] things that are uncognized [incognita] », just as (St.) Augustine says in the tenth (book) On the Trinity:[2] therefore if an order is attained in the image according to (its) conformity to the uncreated Trinity, therefore according to

Trinitatem increatam.

the reckoning of understanding the processing of the Word is before (that) of love among the divine, most of all [maxime] since through the created image we understand the uncreated Trinity.

2. Item, sicut vult Philosophus,[3] « voluntas est, cuius principium est in ipso cognoscente singularia », ergo voluntas ut voluntas praesupponit cognitionem: ergo emanationem Verbi emanatio Amoris.

it,[3] « it is the will, whose beginning belongs in the very one cognizing singulars », therefore the will as will presupposes cognition: therefore the emanation of Love (presupposes) the emanation of the Word.

3. Item, omne principium secundum rationem intelligendi prius est quam principiatum; sed Filius est principium Spiritus sancti: ergo secundum rationem intelligendi oportet praeintelligere Filium Spritui sancto:[4] ergo et generationem, quae est emanatio Filii, prius quam processionem, quae est Spiritus sancti.

3. Likewise, every beginning according to the reckoning of understanding is before the begun; but the Son is the beginning of the Holy Spirit: therefore according to the reckoning of understanding one is bound [oportet] to understand the Son before the Holy Spirit:[4] therefore also the generation, which is the emanation of the Son, before the procession, which is of the Holy Spirit.

4. Item, in omni natura[5] agente per modum naturae et voluntatis, productio per modum naturae intelligitur ante productionem voluntatis: ergo cum Paer sit natura intellectualis, producens Filium connaturalem et per modum naturae et Spiritum sanctum per modum voluntatis, ut supra tactum est:[6] ergo emanatio Filii prior est secundum rationem intelligendi emanatione Spiritus sancti.

4. Likewise, in every nature[5] acting through a manner of nature and will, the production through the manner of nature is understood before the production of the will: therefore since the Father is an intellectual Nature, producing a connatural Son and through a manner of nature, and the Holy Sprit through a manner of will, as has been touched upon above:[6] therefore the emanation of the Son is prior according to the reckoning of understanding to the emanation of the Holy Spirit.

Contra: 1. Augustinus nono de Trinitate:[7] « Partum mentis praecedit appetitus, quo id quod nosse volumus quaerendo, nascitur proles ipsa notitia »: ergo ante est in imagine creata appetitus, quam sit proles notitia, ergo ante amor quam verbum: ergo et processio ante generationem.

On the contrary: 1. (St.) Augustine (says) in the ninth (book) On the Trinity:[7] « The appetite precedes the minds' giving-birth [partum], by which (appetite) in seeking that which we want to know, knowledge [notitia] itself is born as an offspring »: therefore there is an appetite in the created image before knowledge is the offspring, therefore love (is) before word: therefore procession (is) also before generation.

2. Item, nullus videns rem cognoscit eam,[8] nisi intentio voluntatis applicet vim cognoscentem ipsi cognoscibili, ut patet de homine eunte per viam, qui cum ivit et alibi cogitavit, perfecte nescit, qua transierit, sicut dicit Augustinus in undecimo de Trinitate.[9] Ergo voluntas praecedit ipsam cognitionem, ergo amor verbum in creaturis: ergo pari ratione in Deo, saltem secundum intellectum.

2. Likewise, no one seeing a thing cognizes it,[8] unless the intention of (his) will applies the cognizing force to the cognizable itself, as is clear of the man going along the way, who having gone and thought (himself to be) elsewhere, is thoroughly ignorant of [perfect nescit], (the way) by which he has passed, just as (St.) Augustine says in the eleventh (book) On the Trinity.[9] Therefore the will precedes cognition itself, therefore "love" (precedes) "word" among creatures:

therefore, for an equal reason, in God, at least according to the understanding [secundum intellectum].

3. Item, sicut vult Philosophus, primum et immediatum est idem. Unde ipse in libro Posteriorum,[10] definiens propositionem immediatam, dicit, quod « immediata propositio est illa qua non est altera prior »; sed aeque immediate Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre, ut Filius, ergo aeque primo: ergo nec secundum rem, nec secundum rationem intelligendi generatio Filii praecedit processionem Spiritus ssancti.

3. Likewise, just as the Philosopher wants, the first and the immediate are the same. Whence he himself in the book The Posterior Analytics,[10] defining an immediate proposition, says, that « an immediate proposition is that to which the other is not prior »; but equally immediately does the Holy Spirit proceed from the Father, as (does) the Son, therefore in an equally first manner: therefore neither according to thing, nor according to the reckoning of understanding does the generation of the Son precede the procession of the Holy Spirit.

4. Item, quanto aliquid communius, tanto prius est secundum rationem intelligendi;[11] sed communis spiratio est communior quam generatio, quia convenit Patri et Filio, sed generatio soli Patri: ergo prior est secundum rationem intelligendi spiratio quam generatio.

4. Likewise, as much as anything (is) more common, so much is it more primary [prior] according to the reckoning of understanding;[11] but the common spiration is more common than the generation, because it convenes with the Father and the Son, but the generation with the Father alone: therefore the spiration is more primary according to the reckoning of understanding than the generation.

CONCLUSIO.

Secundum rationem intelligendi generatio Filii prior est spiratione Spiritus sancti, quod triplici ratione probatur.

CONCLUSION

According to the reckoning of understanding, the generation of the Son is prior to the spiration of the Holy Spirit, which is proven with a threefold reason.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, quidquid sit de ordine reali, de quo infra dicetur,[12] tamen secundum rationem intelligendi prior est emanatio Verbi, tum quia Verbum est Spiritus sancti principium, tum etiam quia Verbum procedit per modum naturae, sed Spiritus sanctus per modum liberalis voluntatis, tum etiam quia intelligimus emanationes in personis per emanationes repertas in imagine. In imagine autem constat, quod cognitio et intelligentia praecedit amorem et voluntatem; non tamen volo dicere, quod in divinis sit emanatio ita[13] natura posterior emanatione, sicut reperimus in imagine creata.

I respond: It must be said, that whatsoever concerns the real order, concerning which (more) will be said below,[12] yet according to the reckoning of understanding the emanation of the Word is prior, both because the Word is a principle of the Holy Spirit, and also because the Word proceeds through the manner of the Nature, but the Holy Spirit through the manner of a liberal will, and also because we understand the emanations among the Persons through the emanation found in the image. But in the image it is established, that cognition and understanding [intelligentia] precede love and will; yet I do not want to say, that among the divine the emanation is such that[13] the Nature (is) posterior to the emanation, as we find (it to be) in the created image.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium,

1. To that, therefore, which is objected in

quod appetitus praecedit partum mentis; dicendum, quod ille appetitus habet secundum duplicem sta- / -tum . . .

the contrary, that the appetite precedes the mind’s giving-birth; it must be said that that appetite has, according to (its) twofold / status, . . .

---

[1] Libr. IX. de Trin. c. 12. n. 18.
[2] Cap. 1. n. 1. seqq.
[3] Libr. II. Ethic. c. 1, ubi voluntarium (spontaneum) definitur esse eius, cuius principium in ipso cognoscente singularia, in quibus est actio. — De voluntate ut voluntas seu deliberativa, cui opponitur voluntas ut natura, vide II. Sent. d. 24. p. I. a. 2. q. 3, et IV. d. 49. p. I. q. 2. ad 1.
[4] Plures codd. cum Vat. *quam Spiritum sanctum*, sed minus congrue et contra alios codd. ut G T Y etc. cum ed. 1; cod. X *intelligere Filium prius, quam Spiritum sanctum*.
[5] Auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *natura*, minus bene propter subnexa omissum a Vat.
[6] Dist. 6. q. 2, et d. 10. a. 1. q. 1; ac infra d. 13. q. 1. et 2.
[7] Cap. 12. n. 18, in quibus verbis Vat. cum ed. operum S. Augustini, sed contra nostros codd. et sex primas edd., post *appetitus* addunt *quidam* et post *quaerendo* addiiciunt *et inveniendo*.
[8] Vat., plurimis mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, *ipsam*.
[9] Cap. 8. n. 15.
[10] Libr. I. c. 2.
[11] Vide Aristot., III. Phys. text. 2; et V. Metaph. text. 16. (IV. c. 11.). — Mox in Vat. omittitur perperam *communis*, quod tamen in mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 habetur.
[12] Hic, dub. 1, et infra d. 20. a. 2. q. 1. et 2. — Immediate post ex mss. antiquioribus et ed. 1 adiecimus *tamen*.
[13] Vat. cum cod. cc. male et contra alios codd. et ed. 1 omittit *ita*.

[1] On the Trinity, Bk. IX, ch. 12, n. 18.
[2] Chapter 1, n. 1 ff.
[3] Ethics, Bk. II, ch. 1, where a (spontaneous) will is defined to belong to him, whose beginning (is) in the one cognizing singulars, among which the action is. — On the will, as will or deliberative (power), to which is opposed the will as nature, see Sent., Bk II, d. 24, p. I, a. 2, q. 3, and Bk. IV, d. 49, p. I, q. 2, ad 1.
[4] Very many codices, together with the Vatican edition, have *than the Holy Spirit* [quam Spirituum Sanctum], but less congruously and contrary to the other codices, such as G T Y etc. together with edition 1; codex X has *to understand the Son before the Holy Spirit* [*intelligere Filium prius, quam Spiritum sanctum*].
[5] On the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied the *nature* [natura], omitted less well by the Vatican edition on account of the subjoined.
[6] Distinction 6, q. 2, and d. 10, a. 1, q. 1; and below at d. 13, q. 1 and 2.
[7] Chapter 12, n. 18, in which quote the Vatican edition together with the Opera S. Augustini, but contrary to our codices and the six first editions, to *appetite* [appetitus] adds *a certain* [quidam] and after *in seeking* [quaerendo] they add *an finding* [et inveniendo]
[8] The Vatican edition, disagreeing with very many manuscripts and edition 1, has *it* [ipsam].
[9] Chapter 8, n. 15.
[10] Book I, ch. 2.
[11] See Aristotle, Physics, Bk. III, text 2; and Metaphysics, Bk. V. text 16 (Bk. IV, ch. 11). — Then in the Vatican edition there is faultily omitted *common* [communis], which however is had in the manuscripts and in editions 1, 2 and 3.
[12] Here in dubium 1, and below in d. 20, a. 2, q. 1 and 2. — Immediately after this from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *yet* [tamen].
[13] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, badly and contrary to the other codices and edition 1, omits *such that* [ita].

---

p. 226

sta- / -tum dupliciter considerari:[1] *uno* modo secundum rationem inhiantis ante habitam cognitionem; *alio* modo secundum rationem complectentis, et hoc est post habitam cognitionem, et secundum primum statum est imperfectionis, quantum vero ad secundum est perfectionis. Et ideo quia quod perfectionis est in Deo ponimus, non quod est imperfectionis, ideo appetitus

status, a twofold consideration [dupliciter considerari]:[1] in *one* manner according to the reckoning of the one coveting [inhiantis] before the cognition (has) been had; in *another* manner according to the reckoning of the one embracing, and this is after the cognition (has) been had, and according to the first state it belongs to imperfection, but as much as regards the second it belongs to

secundo modo assimiliatur Spiritui sancto, et hic tenet rationem tertii. Et quod primus sit imperfectionis, patet, quia est ignorantis et desiderantis scientiam acquirere, quod non conveit Deo.

perfection. And for that reason because we posit in God what belongs to perfection, not what belongs to imperfection, for that reason the appetite according to the second manner is likened to the Holy Spirit, and this has the reckoning of the third. And because the first belongs to imperfection, it is clear, that it belongs to the ignorant and to the one desiring to acquire knowledge [scientia], because it does not befit God.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod intentio praeexigitur ad cognitionem; dicendum, quod verum est ad cognitionem acquirendam; sed notitia, prout est in acquirendo, non habet similitudinem cum illo Verbo, ut vult Augustinus in decimo quinto de Trinitate.[2]

2. To that which is objected, that intention is required beforehand for cognition; it must be said, that it is true regarding the cognition to be acquired; but knowledge [notitia], insofar as it is in acquiring, does not have a similitude with that Word, as (St.) Augustine wants it in the fifteenth (book) On the Trinity.[2]

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod aeque immediate procedit Spiritus sanctus; dicendum, quod verum est; sed tamen Spiritus sanctus ita procedit immediate, quod etiam mediante Filio; et ita ex illa ratione oportet praeintelligi emanationem Filii.

3. To that which is objected, that the Holy Spirit proceeds equally immediately; it must be said, that it is true, but yet such does the Holy Spirit proceed immediately, that (He does) also by means of the Son; and thus from that reckoning one is bound [oportet] to understand beforehand the emanation of the Son.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod quanto aliquid communius, tanto prius; dicendum, quod verum est in absolutis, sed non tenet in respectivis, ut patet[3] in generatione et creatione. — Potest tamen dici, quod istud intelligitur de eo quod est commune[4] communitate praedicationis, sed communis spiratio est communis communitate non tantum praedicationis, quia dicitur de Patre et Filio, sed etiam[5] cuiusdam concordiae et connexionis; et tale commune secundum rationem concordiae et amicitiae praesupponit concordantes et connexos, non praeit; et sic patet illud.

4. To that which is objected, that as much as anything is common, so much (is it) more primary [prior]; it must be said, that it is true among absolutes, but it does not hold among relatives [respectivis], as is clear[4] in generation and creation. — However, it can be said, that this is understood of that because it is common[4] by a community of predication, but the common spiration is common by a community not only of predication, because it is said of the Father and the Son, but also (by a community)[5] of a certain concord and connection; and such a common ("being") according to the reckoning of concord and friendship presupposes those in concord [concordantes] and those connected, it does not go before (them); and thus that (argument) is clear.

SCHOLION.

In conclusione omnes Scholastici antiqui consentiunt: Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 46. m. 7. — Scot., I. Sent. d. 11. q.1. — S. Thom., hic a. 1. — B. Albert., I. Sent. d. 28. a. 2. circa finem. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 4.1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., S. a. 54. q. 5. n. 12, et q. 6.n. 26. 34. — Durand., hic q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic

SCHOLIUM

In the conclusion all the ancient Scholastics agree: Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 46, m. 7. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, Sent, Bk. I, d. 11, q. 1. — St. Thomas, here in a. 1. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus Magnus, Sent, Bk. I, d. 28, a. 2 near the end. — Richard of Middletown, here in a. 4. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st princ., q. 1. — Henry of

q. 2.

Ghent, Summa, a. 54, q. 5, n. 12, and q. 6, nn. 26 and 34. — Durandus, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2.

---

[1] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *duplicem*, Vat. vero omittit *dupliciter*; occasio huius omissionis ex repetitione dictorum terminorum praestabatur; lectionem nostram, quae subnexis congruit, exhibetur in cod. T et a secunda manu in cod. ff. — Mox sub verbo *inhiantis* intelligas vehementer desiderantis, sicuti sub verbo *complectentis* intendas fruentis.
[2] Cap. 13. n. 22. Codices, capitulum in librum mutantes, falso legunt *in decimo tertio et decimo quinto*. — Paulo ante in Vat. et cod. cc *plenitudinem* loco *similitudinem*, sed incongrue et contra vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1.
[3] Ex mss. et ed. 1 restituimus verbum *patet*.
[4] Plures mss. ut I T Y Z cum ed. 1 *communius*.
[5] Vat. absque auctoritate codd. et edd. 1, 2, 3 repetit hic *communitate*.

[1] Very many codices, together with edition 1, omit the first *twofold* [duplicem], but the Vatican edition omits the second *twofold* [dupliciter], on account of the repetition of the aforesaid terms; our reading, which is congruous with what follows, is exhibited in codex T and by a second hand in codex ff. — Then under the word *of the one coveting* [inhiantis] understand “of the one strongly desiring”, just as under the word *of the one embracing* [complectentis] understand “of the one enjoying”.
[2] Chapter 13, n. 22. The codices, changing the chapter into the book, falsely read *in the thirteenth and fifteenth* [in decimo tertio et decimo quinto]. — A little before this in the Vatican edition and in codex cc, *plenitude* [plenitudinem] is put in place of *similitude* [similitudinem], but incongruously and against the older codices together with edition 1.
[3] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored the verb *is clear* [patet].
[4] Very many manuscripts, such as I T Y and Z together with edition 1, have *more common* [communius].
[5] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the codices and editions 1, 2 and 3, repeats here *by a community* [communitate].

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XII.

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XII

DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 226-227.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo de argumento haeretici, quod facit ibi: *Aut nato iam Filio, aut non nato*. Videtur enim istud argumentum necessarium, quia cuiuslibet contradictionis necessarium est alteram partem esse veram;[6] sed *natum* et *non natum* opponuntur contradictorie: ergo necesse est alteram partem dare,[7] quod Spiritus sanctus procedat aut nato iam Filio, aut non nato: cum igitur Magister[8] et Augustinus respondeant interimendo utramque partem, videntur male respondere.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod haereticus in sua quaestione quaerebat de ordine generationis Filii ad processionem Spiritus sancti, et quaerebat de ordine secundum durationem et tempus, non secundum rationem intelligendi, et quaerebat, utrum prius natus est Filius, quam processit[9] Spiritus sanctus, aut e converso. Et utrumque falsum erat; ideo Magister et Augustinus considerantes intentionem haeretici sive interrogationem secundum sensum, in quo eam proponit, simpliciter et bene respondent eam interimendo.

Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur, quod divisio haeretici est per contradictoria; dicendum, quod falsum est; quia propositio contradictoria accipitur negando compositionem principalem;[10] sed ipse fert negationem ad compositionem non principalem, sed intellectam in hoc quod est *nato*;[11] et ideo causa falsitatis semper remanet. Haec enim est falsa: Spiritus sanctus procedit, nato Filio; quia notatur, quod nativitas Filii praecedat procesionem Spiritus sancti. Haec iterum est falsa: processit, non nato Filio; quia notatur, quod

DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 226-227.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Doubt I

In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first concerning the argument of the heretic, which he makes there: *Either with the Son already born, or with Him not born*. For it seems that that argument of his (is) necessary, because of any contradiction it is necessary that the other part be true;[6] but *born* and *not born* are opposed contradictorily: therefore it is necessary to give the other part,[7] that the Holy Spirit proceeds either with the Son already born, or with Him not born: since, therefore, Master (Peter)[8] and (St.) Augustine respond by refuting [interimendo] each part, they seem to respond badly.

I respond: It must be said, that the heretic in his question asked concerning the order of the generation of the Son to the procession of the Holy Spirit, and asked concerning the order according to duration and time, not according to the reckoning of understanding, and he asked, whether the Son was born before the Holy Spirit proceeded,[9] or (if it was) the other way around. And each was false; for that reason Master (Peter) and (St.) Augustine, considering the intention of the heretic or the interrogation (he made) according to the sense, in which he proposes it, respond simply and well by refuting it.

To that, therefore, which is objected, that the heretic's division is through contradictories; it must be said, that it is false; because a contradictory proposition is accepted by denying the principle composition;[10] but he brings the negation not against the principle composition, but (against it as) understood in this that He *has been born*;[11] and for this reason the cause of its falsity always remains. For this is false: 'the Holy Spirit proceeds, with the Son born'; because it is noted, that the nativity of the Son precedes the procession

nativitas Filii non fuerit simul cum processione Spiritus sancti. Sed haec est vera: Spiritus sanctus non processit, nato prius Filio, quia simul fuit nativitas Filii et processio Spiritus sancti.[12]

of the Holy Spirit. Again, this is false: 'He has proceeded, with the Son not born'; because there is noted, that the nativity of the Son was not together [simul] with the procession of the Holy Spirit. But this is true: 'The Holy Spirit has not proceeded, with the Son born beforehand', because the nativity of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit were together.

---

[6] Aristot. I. Periher. c. 6. (c. 8.).
[7] In cod. Y additur *videlicet*.
[8] Hic, c. 1, ubi et verba Augustini habentur.
[9] Unus alterve codex ut I bb cum ed. 1 *natus esset Filius quam processisset*.
[10] Id est, copulam, quae hic fit verbo *procedit*.
[11] B. Albert., hic a. 2.ad ul. ait: Dicendum, quod licet natum et non natum habeant modum oppositionis contradictoriorum, tamen propositiones, in quibus ponuntur, non sunt contradictoriae, istae scilicet: aut processit iam nato, aut processit iam non nato, quia negatio non fertur ad compositionem (copulam), et ideo sunt ambae affirmativae. — Similia dicit Petr. a Tar., hic a. 1. a. 1. ad 1
[12] Cfr. hic, q. 1; et Richard., hic q. 1. ad ult.

[6] Aristotle, Periher., Bk. I, ch. 6 (ch. 8).
[7] In codex Y there is added *namely* [videlicet].
[8] Here, in ch. 1, where the words of (St.) Augustine are also had.
[9] One or the other codex, such as I and bb together with edition 1, has *the Son would have been born before He had proceeded* [natus esset Filius quam processisset].
[10] That is, the copula, which here becomes the verb *proceeds* [procedit].
[11] Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 2, in reply to the last, says: It must be said, that though "born" and "not born" have the manner of opposition of contradictories, yet the propositions, in which they are posited, are not contradictory, these, that is: 'either He proceeded with Him already born, or He proceeded with Him not already born', because the negation is not born to the composition (copula), and for that reason they are both affirmative. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise says similar things, here in a. 1, q. 1, ad 1.
[12] Cf. here, q. 1; and Richard (of Middletown), here in q. 1, at the last reply.

---

p. 227

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicitur: *Quidquid Unigento dedit, gignendo dedit*. Videtur male dicere, quia si hoc; sed[1] dedit ei spirationem, ergo dedit eam gignendo, ergo spiratio est genita. Sed quidquid dicitur in divinis concrete, dicitur et abstracte, sed non convertitur: ergo si spiratio est genita, spiratio est generatio, quod est contra omnes modo.[2]

Doubt II

Is likewise asked concerning this which is said: *Whatever He gave to the Only-Begotten, He gave by begetting*. It seems that he spoke badly, because if this (were true); but[1] He gave Him the spiration, therefore He gave it by begetting, therefore the spiration has been begotten. But whatever is said among the divine concretely, is said also abstractly, but it is not converted: therefore if the spiration has been begotten, the spiration is the generation, which is contrary to (what) all now (say).[2]

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod defectus est in utroque argumento. Nam illud non valet: dedit generando spirationem, ergo generavit spirationem; sicut non sequitur: generando dedit Filio essentiam, ergo

I respond: It must be said, that there is a defect in each argument. For this is not valid: 'He gave spiration by generating, therefore He generated the spiration'; just as there does not follow: 'by generating He

essentia est genita. Aliqua enim per generationem dicuntur dari, quae non dicuntur generari.

Et iterum alia ratio non valet: spiratio est genita, ergo spiratio est generatio. Sicut enim infra patebit de duabus notionibus unius personae,[3] verum est, quod una praedicatur de altera denominative, non in abstractione; et ideo non valet illa ratio, immo est ibi accidens. Quod ergo dicitur: quidquid praedicatur denominative et abstracte, verum est de essentia; sed non est verum de proprietate personae; et haec infra melius patebunt.[4]

Dub. III.

Item dubitatio est de hoc quod dicit Hieronymus: *Credimus in Spiritum sanctum, qui de Patre proprie procedit*. Videtur enim falsum dicere, quia « *proprium* est quod convenit uni soli »:[5] ergo si de Patre procedit *proprie*, non ergo de Filio. *Si tu dicas*, quod non dicit *proprie* contra communitatem, sed contra improprietatem: ergo videtur quod improprie procedat a Filio.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *proprie* non dicit proprietatem sive solitudinem, sed sonat in[6] auctoritatem, sicut *principaliter*. Sicut enim Pater *principaliter* dicitur spirare, quia hoc non habet ab alio; ita etiam *proprie*, quia hanc conditionem, *non habere ab alio*, nulli communicat; ita videtur dicere Magister.

Potest tamen dici, quod uno modo proprium dicitur contra communitatem; alio modo contra improprietatem; tertio modo accipitur pro appropriatione;[7] et sic accipitur hic. Quamvis enim spiratio aeque vere et proprie conveniat Patri et Filio, tamen Hieronymus appropriat eam Patri propter auctoritatem.[8]

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Hilarius

---

gave the Son (His) Essence, therefore the Essence has been begotten'. For some (things) are said through generation to be given, which are not said to be generated.

And again the other reckoning is not valid: 'the spiration has been begotten, therefore the spiration is the generation'. For just as shall be clear below concerning the two notions of one Person,[3] it is true, that one is predicated of the other denominatively, not in abstraction, and for that reason that reckoning is not valid, nay rather there it is an accident. What, therefore, is said: 'whatever is predicated denominatively and abstractly', is true concerning the Essence, but it is not true concerning the property of the Person, and these (points) shall be clearer below.[4]

Doubt III

Likewise there is a doubt concerning this which (St.) Jerome says: *We believe in the Holy Spirit, who proceeds properly from* [de] *the Father*. For it seems that he spoke a falsehood, because « the *proper* is that which convenes with one alone »:[5] therefore if He proceeds from the Father *properly*, therefore (He does) not (proceed properly) from the Son. *If you say*, that he does not mean *properly* against community, but against impropriety: therefore it seems that He proceeds improperly from [a] the Son.

I respond: It must be said, that *properly* does not mean propriety or solitude, but refers to [sonat in][6] (His) authorship, just as *principally* (does). For just as the Father is said to *principally* spirate, because this he does not have from an other; so also *properly*, because this condition, *not having from an other*, He communicates to no one; thus does Master (Peter) seem to speak.

However it can be said, that in one manner the *proper* is meant against community; in another manner against impropriety; in a third manner it is accepted as an appropriation;[7] and in this manner is it accepted here. For although the spiration equally truly and properly convenes with the Father and the Son, nevertheless (St.) Jerome appropriates it to the Father on account of (His) authorship.

Doubt IV

Is likewise asked of this which (St.) Hilary

loquens ad Patrem: *Ex te per eum Spiritus sanctus tuus est*. Videtur enim male dicere dicendo *per eum*, quia, ut dicit Praepositivus,[9] *per* cum verbis transitivis significat subauctoriatem, sed cum absolutis auctoritatem; ut patet, cum dicitur: ego sum sapiens per Deum, in Deo notatur auctoritas. Cum ergo dicitur, quod Spiritus sanctus est a Patre per Filium, in Filio notatur auctoritas.

says, speaking to the Father: *Out of Thee through Him is Thy Holy Spirit*. For he seems to speak badly, when saying *through Him*, because, as Praepositivus says,[9] *through* with transitive verbs signifies sub-authorship, but with absolutes authorship; as is clear, when there is said: 'I am wise through God', in God is noted the authorship (of wisdom). Therefore when there is said, that the Holy Spirit is from the Father through the Son, the authorship is noted in the Son.

R**ESPONDEO:** Dicendum, quod aliqui voluerunt dicere, quod haec est impropria: Spiritus sanctus est a Patre per Filium sive procedit; et debet resolvi in hanc: Spiritus sanctus spiratur a Patre per Filium; et consentiunt rationi praedictae. — Sed cum ista sit vera: creatura procedit a Patre per Filium, et haec similiter: exit vel procedit: non video rationem, quare similiter illa verba Hilarii non possint proprie dici.

I **RESPOND:** It must be said, that some want to say, that this is improper: 'The Holy Spirit is or proceeds from the Father through the Son'; and (that) it ought to be resolved into this: 'The Holy Spirit is spirated by the Father through the Son'; and they agree with the aforesaid reckoning. — But since this is true: 'a creature proceeds from the Father through the Son', and this similarly: 'it goes forth and/or proceeds': I do not see the reason, why similarly those words of (St.) Hilary cannot be properly said.

Et[10] propterea est dicendum, quod quamvis procedere non sit verbum transitivum quantum ad modum significandi, quia non contruitur cum accusativo; quia tamen aequivalet[11] transitivo, ut cum dicitur: procedit a Patre per Filium, iudicandum est sicut de verbo transitivo; et ideo dicit subauctoritatem.[12]

And[10] on this account it must be said, that although "to proceed" is not a transitive verb as much as regards (its) manner of signifying, because it is not constructed with the accusative; nevertheless because it is equivalent[11] to a transitive, as when there is said: 'He proceeds from the Father through the Son', it must be judged just as a transitive verb; and for that reason ("through" here) means a sub-authority.[12]

---

[1] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3, 6 *esset verum* loco *sed*; simili eliptica locutione S. Bonav. saepius utitur.
[2] Ita fere omnes codd. cum ed. 1; cod. cc omittit *modo*, pro quo Vat. *modernos*.
[3] Dist. 33. q. 3. et 4. — Mox post *verum est* Vat. cum cod. cc, aliis tamen codd. et ed. 1 refragantibus, addit *dicere*. Paulo infra post *denominative* in cod. T apponitur *sed*.
[4] Loco paulo supra citato. — Antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1 in eo conveniunt, quod in ultima propositione adiungant a Vat. et cod. cc omissum *melius*, sed in eo dissentiunt, quod alii ut A G H I T etc. cum ed. 1 exhibent lectionem nostram, alii modo singulari *et hoc infra melius patebit*; cod. Z *et hoc similiter melius patebit*. — De solutione huius dubii vide etiam B. Albert., hic a. 7.
[5] Aristot., I. Topic. c. 4. et Porphyr., de Praedicab. c. de Proprio. — Paulo infra fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *dicit*, scilicet Hieronymus, loco *dicitur*.

[1] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3 and 6, has *were true* [esset verum] in place of *but* [sed]; a similar elliptical phrase is often used by St. Bonaventure.
[2] Thus nearly all the codices, together with edition 1; codex cc omits *now* [modo], in place of which the Vatican edition has *modern (authors)* [modernos].
[3] Distinction 33, q. 3 and 4. — Then after *it is true* [est verum], the Vatican edition, together with codex cc, yet disagreeing with the other codices and edition 1, adds *to say* [dicere]. A little below this after *denominatively* [denominative] in codex T there is inserted *but* [sed].
[4] In the passage cited a little above this. — The more ancient codices, together with edition 1, agree in this, that in the last proposition they add the *–er* [melius] to *it will be clear* [patebit], omitted by the Vatican edition and codex cc, but they disagree in this, that some, such as A G H I T etc. together with edition 1, exhibit our reading, others in a singular manner have *and this shall be clearer below* [et hoc

[6] Auctoritate fere omnium mss. et trium primarum edd. restituimus praepositinem *in*; familiaris siquidem est S. Doctori haec locutio *sonare in*.
[7] Plurimi codd. cum tribus primis edd. *per appropriationem*. Melius legeretur *pro appropriato*. Paulo infra mss. cum sex primis edd. perperam *Filius* loco *Hieronymus*.
[8] Solutioni consentit S. Thom., S. I. q. 36. a. 3. ad 2. et Scot., hic q. 2.
[9] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 *Priscianus*.
[10] In Vat. omittitur *Et*, refragantibus mss. et ed. 1.
[11] Ed. 1 *aequipollet*. Paulo infra post *Filium* codd. H Y addunt *tantum valet ac si diceretur, producitur*.
[12] Explicationem textus Hilarii et significationem praepositionis *per* vide etiam in S. Thom., S. I. q. 36. a. 3. in corp. et ad. 4; B. Albert., hic a. 6; Scot., hic q. 2.

infra melius patebit]; codex Z has *and this similarly will be clearer below* [et hoc similiter melius patebit]. — On the solution of this dubium, see also Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 7.
[5] Aristotle, Topics, Bk. I, ch. 4, and Porphyry, On the Predicables, ch. “On the Proper”. — A little below this, trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *he does . . mean* [dicit], that is St. Jerome means, in place of *there is meant* [dicitur].
[6] On the authority of nearly all the manuscripts and the three first editions, we have restores the preposition *to* [in]; because this Latin metaphor *to sound to* [sonare in] for *to refers to* is a saying familiar to the Seraphic Doctor.
[7] Very many codices, together with the three first editions, have *through an appropriation* [per appropriationem]. It would be better to read it *as an appropriated (term)* [pro appropriato]. A little below this the manuscripts, together with the first six editions, faultily read *the Son* [Filius] in place of *(St.) Jerome* [Hieronymus].
[8] To the solution St. Thomas agrees, Summa, I, q. 36, a. 3, ad 2, and (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 2.
[9] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, has *Priscian* [Priscianus].
[10] In the Vatican edition there is omitted *And* [Et], in disagreement with the manuscripts and edition 1.
[11] Edition 1 has *is equipollent* [aequipollet]. A little below this after *the Son* [Filium], codices H and Y add *it is only valid if it were also said, is produced* [tantum valet ac si diceretur, producitur].
[12] See the explanation of this text of (St.) Hilary and the signification of the preposition *through* [per] also in St. Thomas, Summa, I, q. 36, a. 3 in the body, and in reply to n. 4, Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 6; (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, here in q. 2.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.